THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

616963

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

SIXTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

5 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXLIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TENTH DAY OF JULY
TO THE TWENTY-FIRST DAY OF JULY, 1905.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

1905.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_july-10-july-21-1905_149

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41	Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42	—	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42	Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44	Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45	—	1805
— 6 & 7	46	—	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47	Geo. III.	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48	Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49	—	1809
— 15 — 17	50	—	1810
— 18 — 20	51	—	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52	—	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53	Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54	—	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55	—	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56	—	1816
— 35 & 36	57	—	1817
— 37 — 38	58	—	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59	Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60	—	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	Geo. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2	—	1821
— 6 — 7	3	—	1822
— 8 — 9	4	—	1823
— 10 — 11	5	—	1824
— 12 — 13	6	—	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7	—	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7	Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8	—	1827
— 18 & 19	9	—	1828
— 20 — 21	10	—	1829
— 22 to 25	11	—	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	Will. IV.	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8	2	Will. IV.	1832
— 9 — 14	3	—	1831

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20	4	Will. IV.	1833
— 21 — 25	5	—	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30	6	Will. IV.	1835
— 31 — 35	7	—	1836
— 36 — 38	8	—	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 —107	12	—	1849
—	108 —113	13	—	1850
—	114 —118	14	—	1851
—	119 —122	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 —135	17	—	1854
—	136 —139	18	—	1855
—	140 —143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol.	145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 —151	21	—	1858
—	152 —153	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 —160	23	—	1860
—	161 —164	24	—	1861
—	165 —168	25	—	1862
—	169 —172	26	—	1863
—	173 —176	27	—	1864
—	177 —180	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
—	185 —189	30	—	1867
—	190 —193	31	—	1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
—	199 —203	33	—	1870
—	204 —208	34	—	1871
—	209 —213	35	—	1872
—	214 —217	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 —226	38	—	1875
—	227 —231	39	—	1876
—	232 —236	40	—	1877
—	237 —242	41	—	1878
—	243 —249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 —265	44	—	1881
—	266 —273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 —292	47	—	1884
—	293 —301	48	—	1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.

Vol.	308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 —332	51	—	1888
—	333 —340	52	—	1889
—	341 —348	53	—	1890
—	349 —356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	1904
—	141 to 149	5	—	1905

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour.
Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education——Most Hon. the Marquess of Londonderry, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury.
Secretaries of State——
  Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of Lansdowne, K.G.
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas, M.P.
  Colonial——Rt. Hon. Alfred Lyttelton, M.P.
  War——Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster, M.P.
  India——Rt. Hon. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. J. Austen Chamberlain, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty—Rt. Hon. Earl Cawdor.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
President of the Board of Trade——Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P.
Secretary for Scotland——Most Noble the Marquess of Linlithgow.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. Gerald Balfour, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. Walter Long, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Victor Cavendish, Esq., M.P.
Secretary to the Board of Education——Sir William Anson, M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——E. G. Pretyman, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
  Lord Balcarres, M.P.
  H. W. Forster, Esq., M.P.
  Lord Edmund Talbot, M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
  Admiral Sir John Fisher, G.C.B.
  Rear-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury, K.C.S.I.
  Rear-Admiral W. H. May, M.V.O.
  Capt. F. G. Inglefield, R.N.
Civil Lord of the Admiralty——Arthur H. Lee, Esq., M.P.
Army Council——
  The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
  Lt.-Gen. Sir N. G. Lyttelton, K.C.B., (Chief of General Staff).
  Major-General C. W. H. Douglas (Adjutant-General).
  Major-General H. C. O. Plumer, C.B. (Quartermaster-General).
  Major-General Sir J. W. Murray, K.C.B. (Master General of the Ordnance).
  The Under-Secretary of State for War.
  The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
  Secretary. The Permanent Under-Secretary of State for War (Col. Sir E. W. D. Ward, K.C.B.).
Inspector-General of the Forces——General H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, K.G., K.P., etc.
Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Earl Percy, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Hon. T. H. Cochrane, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Most Noble the Marquess of Bath.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Donoughmore.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——A. Bonar Law Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——J. Grant Lawson, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office—W. Bromley Davenport, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. Sir R. B. Finlay, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. Sir E. Carson, K.C., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
The Lord Advocate——C. Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Walrond, Bt., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Judge Advocate-General——

Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of CLARENDON, G.C.B.
Vice-Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Lord WOLVERTON.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of PEMBROKE AND MONTGOMERY, G.C.V.O.
Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of PORTLAND, K.G., G.C.V.O.
Paymaster-General——Rt. Hon. Sir SAVILE CROSSLEY, Bt., M.V.O., M.P.
Comptroller of the Household——Viscount VALENTIA, M.V.O., M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——The Marquess of HAMILTON, M.P.
Captain Yeomen of the Guard—Rt. Hon. Earl WALDEGRAVE.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- Rt. Hon. Earl of KINTORE, G.C.M.G.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of DENBIGH.
- Rt. Hon. Viscount CHURCHILL, K.C.V.O.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of ERROL.
- Rt. Hon. Lord LAWRENCE.
- Rt. Hon. Lord SUFFIELD, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
- Rt. Hon. Lord KENYON.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——The Most Noble the Marquess of LINLITHGOW.
Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. LORD DUNEDIN.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. C. SCOTT DICKSON, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord KINSBURGH, C.B.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of LEVEN AND MELVILLE.
Solicitor-General——E. T. SALVENSEN, Esq., K.C.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl of DUDLEY.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord ASHBOURNE.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. WALTER LONG, M.P.
Under Secretary——Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I. K.C.V.O.
Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction——President: The Rt. Hon. the CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND; Vice-President: Rt. Hon. HORACE PLUNKETT.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. ATKINSON, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——J. H. M. CAMPBELL, Esq., K.C., M.P.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of ONSLOW.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir HENRY J. L. GRAHAM, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. THESIGER, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——EDWARD HALL ALDERSON, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——ALBERT GRAY, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. HARRISON, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
- Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. SKENE, Esq.
- Clerk of the Journals——W. A. LEIGH, Esq.
- Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.
- Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. ANSTRUTHER, Esq.
- W. H. HAMILTON GORDON, Esq.

Other Clerks—Hon. A. MCDONNELL; A. H. ROBINSON, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. ST. JOHN, Esq.; V. M. BIDDULPH, Esq.; Hon. E. A. STONOR; H. J. F. BADELEY, Esq.; C. HEADLAM, Esq.; J. B. HOTHAM, Esq.; E. C. VIGORS, Esq.; A. TENNYSON, Esq.; and G. D. LUARD, Esq.
Accountant and Copyist——Mr. T. A. COURT.
Assistant Copyists——Mr. H. P. NORRIS and Mr. R. A. COURT.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. WORFELL, C. E. CHIZLETT, A. M. STOLL, J. W. F. LOCKE, J. MCMILLAN, G. BENNETT, G. T. PHILIP.
Librarian——EDMUND GOSSE, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. BUTLER.
Attendant——Mr. W. WORFELL.

Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir F. H. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane, B. Gallop.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, J. B. Forsyth, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. Williams.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——R. Dickinson, Esq.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.; H. C. Tower, Esq.; C. V. Frere, Esq.; L. T. Le Marchant, Esq.; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Assistant Clerks——S. L. Simeon, Esq.; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.; E. C. Howe Browne, Esq.; Horace West, Esq.; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq.; Percy A. Bull, Esq.; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq.; W. E. Grey, Esq.; F. C. Holland, Esq.; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.
Junior Clerks——H. C. Dawkins, Esq.; R. P. Colomb, Esq.; B. H. Fell, Esq.; R. E. Childers, Esq.; J. Scott Porter, Esq.; F. C. Bramwell, Esq.; W. T. Legge, Esq., C. R. Turner, Esq.; W. K. Gibbons, Esq.; A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq.; K. J. C. Moorsom, Esq.; R. D. Radcliffe, Esq., W. P. Johnstone, Esq.
Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Sergeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Edward Gully, Esq., C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. Chandos Leigh, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.
Messenger——Mr. W. Murrell.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq.; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Vote Office——
  Principal Clerk——Philip Smith, Esq.
  Assistant Clerks——H. Otway Mayne, Esq.; John Poyser, Esq.
  Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq.; Assistant Librarian——Temple Franks, Esq., B.C.L.
  Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Printers——
  Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
  Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. I. Lincoln; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. Bullock.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. C. Davie, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward J. Ivory, G. Norman, J. Surrey, A. Sepple.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. Inglefield and Mr. H. Hambling.

Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. T. B. SPRAY, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY, Mr. J. HENDERSON,

Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. G. WAINWRIGHT, J. GUYATT, R. TURTLE, A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT, J. L. PHILIP, W. FINDLAY.

Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY; Assistant——Mr W. BROADBENT; Porters——Messrs. J. ORAM and J. HART.

Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXLIX.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1905.

Page

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 10TH JULY, 1905.

SAT FIRST.—The Earl of Chichester sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4); Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5); Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6).

Also the Certificates that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills:—Local Government Provisional Order (No. 16); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 17).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.—Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill, ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed.

Read, and agreed to 2

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill; North British Railway (General Powers) Bill.—The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bills was withdrawn. The orders made on Monday and Tuesday last discharged, and Bills committed .. .. ..

Woolwich Borough Council Bill; Great Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill; Andover Lighting and Power Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons .. ..

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} -tomorrow 2

July 10.] Page

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3^{a} to-morrow .. ..

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 133.) 3

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Regulations for the instruction and training of pupil teachers 3

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, K.G., preserved at Belvoir Castle. Vol. IV. 3

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).—Report to the Secretary for Scotland of a Departmental Committee on the sea fisheries of Sutherland and Caithness. Volume II. Minutes of evidence and appendices.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 3

POST OFFICE STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS, 1905.—1. (Money Orders) No. 783. The Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment (No. 4) Regulations, 1905; dated 29th June, 1905.

2. (Post Office Savings Banks) No. 785. The Post Office Savings Banks Regulations, 1905; dated 15th May, 1905 3

NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.—Account of deposits in Naval Savings Banks and the payments thereof, and of interest thereon, of all investments under the Naval Savings Banks Act, 1866, and the application of the interest or dividends accruing in respect thereof, and of the sale of any stocks, annuities, or securities during the financial year 1903–1904 3

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) ACTS, 1860 TO 1904.—Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the appointment of a visiting committee to the prison at Glasgow (Duke Street).

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 3

NEW BILL.

Royal Declaration Bill [H.L.]—A Bill to modify the declaration required by the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement to be made by the Sovereign. Was presented by the Viscount Llandaff; read 1^{a}; and to be printed. (No. 131.) 4

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Moved, That Standing Order No. XXXIX. be suspended for this day's sitting.—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne*); agreed to; and ordered accordingly 4

Drunkenness (Ireland) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} on Friday next. — (*The Earl of Mayo.*) (No. 132.) 4

Page

HOME DEFENCE.

The Earl of Wemyss 4

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House, it would be a danger to the Realm, and limit the power of the Navy as an offensive force in war, to trust to it alone for home defence, and, inasmuch as it is admitted that the Navy cannot guarantee us against so-called hostile 'raids,' it is the more needful that our land defences should at all times be such that no nation would ever attempt, in any form, a hostile landing on our shores."—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

Earl Roberts 13
Lord Ellenborough 19
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*Earl of Donoughmore*) 23
Viscount Goschen 27
Lord Newton 32
Lord Muskerry 35
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 36
The Marquess of Ripon 44
The Earl of Wemyss 47

On Question, Motion agreed to.

FLOATING MINES.

Lord Muskerry 49
The Secretary for Scotland (*The Marquess of Linlithgow*) 53

DOCKYARD DISCHARGES.

The Lord Bishop of Winchester 54
The Marquess of Linlithgow 56

War Stores (Commission) Bill.—On the Order to go into Committee on this Bill.

The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 58
The Marquess of Ripon 58

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Bill read 3^a, and passed.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 10TH JULY, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—

Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [Lords].

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 59

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords].

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 59

Hitchin and District Gas Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 59

Hessle Gas Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 59

Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [LORDS]; Tees Valley Water Board Bill [Lords]; Whitby Urban District Council Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 59

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 60

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [LORDS]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 60

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 60

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 60

July 10.] *Page*

Thames Conservancy Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 60

PETITIONS.

PURSHAD, THAKUR.—Petition of Thakur Purshad, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table 60

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

DEER FORESTS (HIGHLAND CROFTING COUNTIES).—Return [presented 29th June]; to be printed. [No. 232.].. 60

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.—Copy presented, of Memorandum by the President of the Local Government Board [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 60

IMPERIAL REVENUE (COLLECTION AND EXPENDITURE) (GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 8th March; *Mr. Joseph A. Pease*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 233.] 60

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).—Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment (No. 4) Regulations, 1905, dated 29th June, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 61

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK (REGULATIONS).—Copy presented, of Post Office Savings Bank Regulations, 1905, dated 15th May, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 61

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of Report on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, K.G., preserved at Belvoir Castle, Vol. IV. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 61

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Regulations for the Instruction and Training of Pupil Teachers from August 1st, 1905, to July 31st, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 61

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary for Scotland of a Departmental Committee on the Sea Fisheries of Sutherland and Caithness. Vol. II. Minutes of Evidence and Appendices [by Command] to lie upon the Table 61

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the appointment of a Visiting Committee to the Prison at Glasgow (Duke Street) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 61

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS.—Copy presented, of Report of Proceedings by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, under the Diseases of Animals Acts, for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 61

NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.—Account presented, of Deposits in Naval Savings Banks, and the payments thereof and the interest thereon, etc., during the financial year 1903–4 [By Act] to lie upon the Table and to be printed [No. 234] 62

July 10.] *Page*

Revenue Bill.—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum explanatary of the Revenue Bill."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 235.] 62

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Council Labour in Cape Colony.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 62

Expenditure and Financial Position of Municipal Corporations.—Question, Mr. Marshall Hall (Lancashire, Southport); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 63

Report of Vagrancy Committee.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 63

Orange Disturbances in Glasgow.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Scott-Dickson 63

Loss of Public Holidays by Excise Officials at Distilleries.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 64

The Crimes Act—Proclaimed Districts in Ireland.—Question, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 64

Aliens Bill—Danger to British Shipping Trade.—Question, Mr. Charles Wilson (Hull, W.); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 66

Local Practitioners attending Patients in Isolation Hospitals.—Question, Sir Charles Welby (Nottinghamshire, Newark); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 67

Surrey Education Committee's Accounts.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 68

Upholstery Work in Government Dockyards.—Question, Mr. Benn (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 69

Vaccination Prosecutions at Dundee.—Question, Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesfield); Answer, Mr. Bonar Law 70

The Indian Viceroy and Lord Kitchener's Army Proposals.—Question, Mr. John Ellis; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 70

Promotion of Assistant Clerks in National Education Office, Dublin.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 71

Applications for Re-instatement by Evicted Tenants in County Waterford.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 72

Grazing Lands on the King-Harman Estate.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 72

The King-Harman Estate.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 73

Page

PURCHASE OF TURBARY ON THE KING-HARMAN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 73

GRAZING LANDS AT CLEW BATEY, COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 74

THE O'DONNELL ESTATE, NEWPORT, COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Dr. Ambrose; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 74

PROMOTION IN IRISH AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 75

IRISH POOR LAW REFORM COMMISSION—PUBLICATION OF REPORT.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 75

GOVERNMENT ORDERS AND BAYONETS.—Question, Mr. J. T. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 76

DRAINAGE OF BORDON CAMP, HAMPSHIRE.—Question, Colonel Wyndham Murray (Bath); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 76

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ARMY EFFICIENCY.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The Secretary of State for War, Mr. Arnold-Forster (Belfast, W.) .. 76

LIABILITY FOR DEBTS OF VOLUNTEER BATTALIONS DISBANDED.—Questions, Mr. Charles Hobhouse; Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 77

THE VOLUNTEERS—THE RECENT CIRCULAR.—Questions, Mr. Charles Hobhouse, Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.), Mr. C. R. Spencer (Northamptonshire, Mid), Major Seely (Isle of Wight) and Mr. Charles Allen; Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 78

THE ARMY COUNCIL AND THE VOLUNTEERS.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent and Major Seely; Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 80

CASE OF CONVICT THOMAS LEONARD AT MARYBOROUGH.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkeny); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 81

JOINT STOCK ENTERPRISES IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Major Evans-Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Lyttelton (Warwick and Leamington) .. 82

COLLECTION OF BRITISH TRADE STATISTICS ABROAD.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Earl Percy (Kensington, S.) 82

MOTOR-CAR SPEED IN ESSEX.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answers, The Presideut of the Local Government Board, Mr. Gerald Balfour (Leeds, Central) .. 82

HOLBORN MUNICIPAL FINANCE DISCLOSURES.—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, Mr. Gerald Balfour 84

July 10.] *Page*

AMALGAMATION OF TRANSVAAL COMPANIES.—Question, Major Evans Gordon; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, Mr. Bonar Law (Glasgow, Blackfriars) .. ..

MERIONETHSHIRE EDUCATION GRANT.—Question, Mr. Osmond Williams (Merionethshire); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education, Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 85

SCOTTISH CHURCHES BILL—GOVERNMENT AMENDMENTS.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Scott Dickson (Glasgow, Bridgton) 86

THE CRIMES ACT PROCLAIMED—DISTRICTS IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), Mr. Haviland Burke (King's County, Tullamore), Mr. Joyce (Limerick), Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick) and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland, Mr. Walter Long (Bristol, S.)

DERRY MCEDMOND ESTATE, CLONLISH, KING'S COUNTY.—Question, Mr. Reddy (King's County, Birr); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 87

F. G. MAYBERRY ESTATE, KENMARE.—Questions, Mr. Boland; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 88

ULSTER'S CLAIM OF THE TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION GRANT.—Questions, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 88

COST OF TEACHING IRISH IN IRISH SCHOOLS.—Questions, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 89

POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS AT IRISH TEACHERS' MEETINGS.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 89

MALICIOUS OUTRAGE IN COUNTY TIPPERARY.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 90

IRISH LORD CHANCELLOR AND STATUTE-MADE MAGISTRATES.—Questions, Mr. Charles Craig, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 90

THE POLICE AND BUNTING DISPLAYS AT ARMAGH.—Question, Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 91

CONNA (CORK) EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 92

WATERFORD EVICTED TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answers, Mr. Walter Long 92

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 93

THE ABSCONDING OF CONSTABLE MASTERSON.—Questions, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory), and Mr. Joyce; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 93

KERRY EVICTED TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.), and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 94

GALWAY—SPECIAL JURORS QUALIFICATIONS.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 95

RELIEF OF THE EDUCATION RATE.—Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 96

ROYAL COMMISSION ON ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE.—Question, Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea, District); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 96

THE UNEMPLOYED BILL.—Questions, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), and Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 96

THE BUTTER BILL.—Questions, Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.), and Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 98

REDISTRIBUTION RESOLUTIONS.—Question, Mr. George Kenyon (Denbigh Boroughs), and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 98

CUSTOMS VOTE.—Question, Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 99

THE COLONIAL CONFERENCE.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 99

THE INQUIRY INTO THE WORKING OF THE MOTOR-CAR ACT.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland), and Mr. Soares; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 99

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 100

MINISTER OF COMMERCE.—Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 101

WORKMAN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland), and Mr. Fenwick (Northumberland, Wansbeck); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 101

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—SIR E. GREY'S VOTE OF CENSURE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid.), Sir Henry Fowler, Mr. Pirie, Mr. Black (Banffshire), Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Parker Smith (Lanarkshire, Partick), General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest), Colonel Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square), Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.), Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 102

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—Reported, from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 236.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 236.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 265.] 109

July 10.] *Page*

Canals (No. 2) Bill.—Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Canals (No. 2) Bill, with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills 109

Selection (Standing Committees).—Mr. Halsey reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice and Legal Procedure:—Mr. Higham and Mr. Joyce; and had appointed in substitution:—Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Jordan.

Report to lie upon the Table 110

NEW BILLS.

Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment (Vincent Square) Bill.—"To amend The Public Schools Act, 1868, so far as it affects Vincent Square, Westminster," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, Mr. Benn, Mr. Burns, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Lough, Mr. Louis Sinclair, Mr. Cust, and Mr. Cohen; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, July 25th, and to be printed. [Bill 266.] 110

Corporal Punishment Restriction Bill.—"To restrict the punishment of whipping to the cases of male offenders under the age of sixteen years," presented by Mr. Lloyd Morgan; supported by Mr. H. D. Greene, Mr. John Burns, and Mr. Abel Thomas; to read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 267.] 110

Aliens Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair]

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 23, to leave out from the word 'if,' to the end of the line, and insert the words 'it can be shown that he has not in his possession or is not in a.'"—(*Mr. Bright.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 198; Noes, 126. (Division List No. 254.)

Lord Hugh Cecil (*Greenwich*) 113

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 24, after the word 'position' to insert the words 'without recourse to poor relief.'"—(*Lord Hugh Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Attorney-General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 115

Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 115

Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 115
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 116
Mr. Lyell (*Dorsetshire, E.*) 116
Mr. Marks (*Kent, Thanet*) 117
Major Seely (*Isle of Wight* 118
Mr. Churchill (*Oldham*) 119
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's*) 120

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 145 ; Noes, 203. (Division List No. 255.)

Mr. Levy (*Leicestershire, Loughborough*) 123

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 24, to leave out the word 'decently.' "—(*Mr. Levy.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'decently ' outstand part of the clause."

Mr. Akers Douglas 124
Mr. John Wilson (*Durham, Mid.*) 125
Mr. Middlemore (*Birmingham, N.*) 126
Mr. Stuart Samuel (*Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel*) 127
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice 127
Mr. Lyell 128
Mr. Herbert Samuel (*Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 129
Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 129
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 130
Mr. John Wilson 131
Mr. Bond (*Nottingham, E.*) 131

Question put and negatived.

Mr. Keir Hardie 131

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, after the word 'or,' to insert the words '(b) if he is being brought into this country under contract, or to take the place of workmen during a trade dispute.' "—(*Mr. Keir Hardie.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 133
Mr. John Wilson 134
Mr. H. Lawson (*Tower Hamlets, Mile End*) 135
Sir Charles Dilke 137
Mr. Keir Hardie 137
Mr. Cremer (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 138

Amendment amended, by leaving out the word "or."

Question proposed, " That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

Mr. Fenwick 138
Mr. Akers Douglas 138

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 148 ; Noes, 215. (Division List No. 256.)

Mr. Atherley Jones (*Durham, N.W.*) 141

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 25, after the word ' or,' to insert the words ' is a skilled workman in any textile or mechanical trade or industry ; or.' "—(*Mr. Atherley-Jones.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Akers Douglas 143
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 144

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Akers-Douglas 145

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 26, after the word ' any ' to insert the words ' disease or.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 145
Mr. Gibson Bowles 145
Dr. Hutchinson (*Sussex, Rye*) 146
Mr. William Rutherford 147

Question put and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 5, after the word ' or,' to insert the words is an anarchist or person who believes in or advocates the overthrow by force or violence of all government or all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials, or.' "—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay 149

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 5, after the word 'or,' to insert the words 'is a person who has been already refused admission to the United Kingdom under this Act, or.' "—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. William Rutherford 149

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 7, after the word 'case,' to insert the words 'or if he is an alien who has been recently rejected by or deported from some other foreign country'."—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay 150

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir Charles Dilke 150

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 9, after the words 'country,' to insert the words 'by reason of the treatment of the religious body to which he belongs or.' "—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) 152
Mr. A. J. Balfour 154
Mr. Stuart Samuel 159
Mr. Cohen 161

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Aliens Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

July 10.] Page

Clause 1 :—

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 9, after the word ' country ' to insert the words ' by reason of the treatment of the religious body to which he belongs or.' "—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question again proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Emmott 163
Mr. Duke (*Plymouth*) 166
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice 167
Mr. Spear (*Devonshire, Tavistock*) 168
Captain Ellice (*St. Andrews Burghs*) 169
Major Evans-Gordon 169
Lord Hugh Cecil 172
Mr. Runciman (*Dewsbury*) 174
Mr. J. F. Hope (*Sheffield, Brightside*) 175
Mr. Sydney Buxton 176
Mr. Renwick (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*) 177
Mr. A. J. Balfour 177

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, to put the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, " That the words ' by reason of the treatment of the religious body to which he belongs or ' be there inserted."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 189 ; Noes, 223. (Division List No. 257.)

The Chairman then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the business allotted to the sitting.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 12, at the end, to insert the words, ' nor shall leave to land be withheld in the case of an immigrant who shows to the satisfaction of the immigration officer or board concerned with the case that, having taken his ticket in the United Kingdom and embarked direct therefrom for some other country immediately after a period of residence in the United Kingdom of not less than six months, he has been refused admission in that country and returned direct therefrom to a port in the United Kingdom.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

" After the words last inserted, to insert the words, ' and leave to land shall not be refused merely on the ground of want of means to any immigrant who satisfies the immigration officer or board concerned

with the case that he was born in the United Kingdom, his father being a British subject, and that he intends to make only a temporary stay in the United Kingdom.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 17, at the end, to insert the words 'or if security is given to his satisfaction that undesirable immigrants will not be landed in the United Kingdom from those ships except for the purpose of transit.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 22, at the end to insert the words 'but an immigrant conditionally disembarked shall not be deemed to have landed so long as the conditions are complied with.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, " That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 237; Noes, 188. (Division List No. 258).

Clause 2 :—

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 30, to leave out the words 'landing of immigrants for the purpose of,' and insert the words 'disembarkation of immigrants for the purpose of inspection' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas*)—instead thereof.

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 33, to leave out the words 'holding of meetings of the board if convenient on an immigrant ship,' and insert the words 'place of meeting of the board.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas*)—instead thereof.

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 36, to leave out the word 'landed,' and insert the word 'disembarked.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas*)—instead thereof.

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 2, line 36, at the end, to insert the words 'Rules made under this section shall provide for notice being given to masters of immigrant ships and immigrants informing them of their right of appeal and also, where leave to land is withheld in the case of any immigrant by the immigration officer, for notice being given to the immigrant and the master of the immigrant ship of the grounds on which leave has been withheld.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 237 ; Noes, 187. (Division List No. 259.)

Clause 3 :—

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 260 ; Noes, 133. (Division List No. 260.)

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress, to sit again to-morrow.

ALIENS (EXPENSES).—Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payments, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salary and remuneration of any officers, inspectors, or persons appointed under any Act of the present session to amend the law with regard to aliens, and of any expenses incurred in carrying such Act into effect." —(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded to put forthwith the Question.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 214 ; Noes, 152. (Division List No. 261.)

Question put, "That the Chairman do report the Resolution to the House."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 160 ; Noes, 126. (Division List No. 262.)

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

Medical Act (1886) Amendment Bill.—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment ; to be read the third time to-morrow 211

DOCKYARD AND CONTRACT BUILT SHIPS.—Return ordered, "of ships of 5,000 tons and upwards built for the Admiralty since the 1st day of January, 1893, in (1) His Majesty's Royal Dockyards; and (2) by contract, under the following headings:—

(1) Name of ship.	(2) Displacement.	(3) Where built.	(4) Date laid down.	(5) Date launched.	(6) Date commissioned.	(7) Completed cost.	(8) Excess or saving on estimate,

—(*Mr. Kearley.*) 212

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to, War Stores (Commission) Bill.

Amendments to—Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution) Bill [Lords]; Mansfield Corporation Bill [Lords]; Hastings Tramways Bill [Lords], without Amendment 212

Adjourned at nineteen minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 11TH JULY, 1905.

COMMISSION.—The following Bills received the Royal Assent:—

1. Consolidated Fund (No. 2).
2. Mr. Speaker's Retirement.
3. War Stores Commission.
4. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10).
5. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13).
6. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4)
7. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7).
8. Highland Railway.
9. Great Northern Railway.
10. University College, London (Transfer).
11. Weaver Navigation.
12. Seaham Gas.
13. Swansea Corporation.
14. South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways.
15. Hythe Corporation.

July 11.] Page

16. Stepney Borough Council (Superannuation).
17. Great Western Railway (New Railways).
18. Hastings Tramways.
19. Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution).
20. Mansfield Corporation.
21. Barrymore Estate.
22. Donovan's Divorce.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed 213

SAT FIRST.—The Lord Boyle (*E. Cork and Orrery*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 213

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dublin, Wicklow and Wexford Railway Bill.—Worcestershire County Council (Bridges) Bill Reported, without Amendment 214

London and North-Western Railway Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments 214

Earl of Stamford's Cheshire Estate Bill [H.L.].—Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill; Dublin United Tramways Bill. Reported, with Amendments 214

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Rhondda Urban District Council Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill—(Durham and Framwelgate Order opposed); Bolton Corporation Bill; Wemyss Dock Bill [H.L.]; North Eastern Railway Bill; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. Leave given to the Select Committee to adjourn over To-morrow 214

Malvern Water Bill.—Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 16th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bills read 2ª accordingly, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 214

Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [H.L].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 214

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Liverpool, etc.) Bill [H.L.].—Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to 214

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 214

July 11.] *Page*

Hitchin and District Gas Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 215

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Paisley District Tramways. Was presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Sections 8 and 9); read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 135) 215

Esk Valley Power-Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Esk Valley Power-Gas. Was presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow; read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Section 7), deemed to have been read 2ª; and reported from the Committee. (No. 136.) .. 215

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 16th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next" be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to; Bills read 2ª accordingly 215

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.—Committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next 215

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 215

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—Committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next 215

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next 215

Millport Piers and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 15

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill [H.L.]—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 216

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (COMMITTEE ON ROYAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE).—Preliminary Report of the Departmental Committee on the Royal College of Science (including the Royal School of Mines) and questions connected therewith 216

ARMY (VOLUNTEERS).—Annual Report of the Volunteer Corps of Great Britain, for the year 1904 216

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS.

Report of proceedings as regards Ireland, for the year 1904.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 216

July 11.] *Page*

Public Meetings (Facilities) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee, to be received on Thursday next, and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 134.) .. 216

Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies) Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Ludlow 216

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Ludlow.*)

Lord Heneage 219

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

Agricultural Rates Act, 1896, etc., Continuance Bill—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 220

HORSE DISEASE IN IRELAND.

The Earl of Mayo 220
The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (The Marquess of Londonderry) 222
Earl Spencer 224
Lord Tweedmouth 225
Lord Burghclere 226
The Marquess of Londonderry 226
The Chairman of Committees (The Earl of Onslow) 227

ADEN PROTECTORATE AND YEMEN.

Lord Reay 229

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for—1. Report on Aden Harbour by the Aden Commission, appointed in August, 1901. 2. Figures of the recent trade of Aden; foreign, local and Indian. 3. Papers on the boundary line between Yemen and the Aden Protectorate."—(*The Lord Reay.*)

Lord Brassey 232
The Under-Secretary of State for India (The Marquess of Bath) 233
The Marquess of Ripon 237
Lord Reay 239

On Question, Motion agreed to; and ordered accordingly.

PASSENGERS TO PLACES OUT OF EUROPE.

The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Duke of Marlborough) 239

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing the Numbers and Nationalities of the Passengers that left the United Kingdom for Places out of Europe in each month from June to December, 1905, distinguishing the principal countries in which the passengers contracted to land."—(*The Duke of Marlborough.*)

Earl Spencer 240
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 240

On Question, Motion, as amended, agreed to and ordered accordingly.

MOROCCO.

Earl Spencer 240
The Marquess of Lansdowne 241

STANDING COMMITTEE.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That they have added the Earl Cadogan to the Standing Committee; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 241

PASSENGERS TO PLACES OUT OF EUROPE.—Return (in part) respecting; laid before the House (pursuant to order of this day), and to be printed. (No. 137.) .. 241

House adjourned at ten minutes past Six o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter-past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 11TH JULY, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

COMMISSION.—Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went;—and, being returned;—Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills (*See* page 213) 241

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Rhymney and Aber Valley Gas and Water Company Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Gosport and Fareham Tramways Bill [LORDS]; Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 242

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [LORDS]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 242

July 11.] *Page*

STANDING ORDERS.—Resolutions reported from the Select Committee.

1. "That, in the case of the South Barracas (Buenos Ayres) Gas and Coke Company Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

2. "That, in the case of the Dover Harbour Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

Resolutions agreed to 242

Littlehampton Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 242

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order relating to the Counties of Essex and Hertford not confirmed; Remaining Orders confirmed] [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).—Ordered, That W. Redfern Kelly do attend the Committee on Group J of Private Bills on Thursday, at half-past Eleven of the clock 243

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 8).—Mr. ASHTON reported from the Committee on Group 8 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned until Thursday, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 243

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP E).—Sir HENRY AUBREY-FLETCHER reported from the Committee on Group E of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Friday, at Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 243

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Woolwich Borough Council Bill; Great Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill; Andover Lighting and Power Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Brentford, Croydon (Rural), Durham Districts, Eastbourne (Willingdon Extension) (Gravesend (Extension to Northfleet), Kingsbury, Old Windsor, and Wimborne and District." [Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Metropolitan Electric Supply Company, Limited, with respect to electrical energy; and for other purposes." [Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [Lords] 243

Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 244

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 268.] 244

PETITIONS.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TAXATION AND PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.—Petition from Islington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 244

SINGH, MAHARAJAH MADHO.—Petition from Pannah State, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table 244

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) PREVENTION AND COMPENSATION BILL.—Petition from Newcastle-upon-Tyne, against; to lie upon the Table 244

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Maidstone; and Wandsworth; to lie upon the Table 244

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).—Paper [presented 10th July]; to be printed. [No. 237.] 244

ARMY (VOLUNTEER CORPS).—Copy presented, of Annual Return of the Volunteer Corps of Great Britain for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 245

ARMY (VOLUNTEERS).—Copy presented, of Circular Letter addressed to General Officers Commanding in Chief, in substitution for the Circular Letter of 20th June, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 245

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).—Copy presented, of Preliminary Report of the Departmental Committee on the Royal College of Science (including the Royal School of Mines), and Questions connected therewith [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 245

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Rule). Copy of Draft Additional Rule in Divorce and Matrimonial Causes under the Rules Publication Act, 1893 [by Act] .. 245

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

THE "KEW BULLETIN."—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 245

REPORT OF SCOTTISH AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 246

ADMIRALTY ORDERS FOR ARMOUR PLATE.—Question, Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 246

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY IN THE NAVY.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 247

July 11.] *Page*

AGE LIMIT FOR MAJOR-GENERALS, ROYAL MARINES.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 247

SWINE FEVER.—Question, Mr. A. K. Loyd (Berkshire, Abingdon); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 247

REPORT OF CAUSES AND SYMPTOMS OF SWINE FEVER.—Question, Mr. A. K. Loyd; Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 248

SUGGESTED ISSUE OF MONTHLY REPORTS ON TRADE OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, Earl Percy 248

BRITISH AND FOREIGN TROOPS IN CRETE.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Earl Percy 249

FINDING OF GOLD ORNAMENTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 249

PUBLICATION OF MANUSCRIPTS OF IRISH FRANCISCANS.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 250

EDUCATION OF LABOURERS IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 250

THE KING-HARMAN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 250

DESTRUCTION OF ANCIENT MONUMENT ON THE KING-HARMAN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 251

COMPLETION OF WORKS AT PAULDUFF PIER, COUNTY WEXFORD.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 251

APPOINTMENT OF RESIDENT MANAGER OF LISLEA NO. 1 NATIONAL SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 251

ARMY RECRUITING.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 252

MILITIA BATTALIONS AND THE SHORT-SERVICE ARMY.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 252

ARMY RECRUITING—LONG AND SHORT SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Marks (Kent, Thanet); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 254

ARMY—VACANCIES FOR OFFICERS IN CAVALRY AND GUARDS.—Question, Mr. Marks; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 255

ARMY—LONG-TERM MEN AVAILABLE FOR INDIAN AND FOREIGN DRAFTS.—Question, Mr. Marks; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 256

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Questions, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), and Mr. Bright (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 256

July 11.] *Page*

TRINCOMALI.—Questions, Major Seely (Isle of Wight, and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 258

MR. VAN RENSBURG.—Questions, Mr. Whitley (Halifax) and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 258

GOOD FRIDAY LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Mr. Burt (Morpeth); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 259

UGANDA—MURDER OF MR. GALT.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 260

ZIONISTS IN EAST AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 260

PARTITION OF BENGAL.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 261

PRESS CENSORSHIP IN INDIA.—Questions, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.), Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Brodrick .. ..

CHINESE COOLIES IN BRITISH NORTH BORNEO.—Questions, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 261

LONDON TRAFFIC COMMISSION REPORT.—Question, Sir George Bartley (Islington, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas (Kent St. Augustine's) 262

BRISTOL CARNIVAL LOTTERY.—Questions. Mr. Reddy (King's County, Birr), and Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 262

HAZEL GROVE (CHESHIRE) DISTURBANCES.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Disraeli (Cheshire, Altrincham), and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Cochrane 263

MOTOR-CAR DRIVERS' LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) .. 264

MOTOR-CAR SPEEDS IN THE PARKS.—Questions, Mr. Scott-Montagu (Hampshire, New Forest), Mr. Soares, (Devonshire, Barnstaple) and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley), and Mr. Gerald Balfour 264

SCOTTISH FISHERY CRUISER "NORNA."—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord-Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 265

RATES IN THE WESTERN HEBRIDES.—Questions, Mr. John Dewar (Inverness), and Mr. Weir; Answers, Mr. Scott Dickson 266

DOG POISONING AT SNEEM.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 267

EVICTED FARMS.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 267

July 11.] Page

The Militia.—Questions, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth), and Mr. Flynn; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour (Manchester, E.) 267

Method of Taking Divisions.—Question, Mr. Scott Dickson, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Swift MacNeill and Mr. Mildmay (Devonshire, Totnes); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 267

Political Pressure by Civil Servants.—Question, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire); Answer, Mr. Swift MacNeill 269

Ministerial Answers.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Speaker and Mr. A. J. Balfour 269

Administrative County of London Electric Bill.—Questions, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.), Mr. Boulnois (Marylebone), Mr. Rutherford (Lancashire, Darwen), and Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell (Glasgow College); Answers, Mr. Halsey (Hertfordshire, Watford) 271

NEW BILLS.

Irish Education (Afflicted Children) Bill.—"To make better provision for the Elementary Education of Afflicted Children in Ireland," presented by Mr. Walter Long; supported by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 269]. .. 273

Musical Copyright Bill.—"To provide further remedies for preventing the infringement of Musical Copyright," presented by Mr. Cochrane; supported by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas, Mr. Attorney-General, and Mr. Solicitor-General; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 270.] 273

Aliens (Expenses).—Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salary and remuneration of any officers, inspectors, or persons appointed under any Act of the present session to amend the Law with regard to Aliens, and of any expenses incurred in carrying such Act into effect."
Resolution read a second time.

Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 273
Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 274

Amendment proposed—

"At end, to add the words "not exceedingly in all in any one year ten thousand pounds."—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. Austen Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) 276
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 277
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 278
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 278
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 279
Sir Gilbert Parker 280

Mr. Bright (Shropshire, Oswestry) 280
Mr. Galloway (Manchester, S.W.) 280
Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland) 281
Mr. David MacIver (Liverpool, Kirkdale) 281
r. George Whiteley (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) 282
Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent) 282
Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) 283
Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) 284
Mr. Akers-Douglas 285
Mr. Churchill (Oldham) 286

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 157 ; —Noes, 224. (Division List No. 263.)

Resolution agreed to.

Aliens Bill.—Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 4 :—

Mr. Emmott (Oldham) 289

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 39, to leave out Sub-section (2)."—(*Mr. Emmott.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'If an expulsion order be made in the case of any alien' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange) 291
Mr. Stuart Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) 292
Mr. Churchill (Oldham) 292
Mr. Charles Wilson (Hull, W.) 293
Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) 294
Mr. Emmott 294
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 295
The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 296
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) 297
Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby) 297
Mr. David MacIver (Liverpool, Kirkdale) 298
Mr. Harwood (Bolton) 299
Mr. Perks (Lincolnshire, Louth) 299
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 300
Mr. Churchill 300
Sir Robert Finlay 301
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 302

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 221 ; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 264.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 39, after the word 'alien,' to insert the words 'not being an alien who last entered the United Kingdom before the commencement of the Act, or an immigrant in whose case leave to land has been given under this Act."'—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Claude Hay (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 305

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 40, to leave out the words 'six months,' and insert the words 'one year.'"—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'six months' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Akers-Douglas 306

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Runciman (*Dewsbury*) 307

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 3, to leave out from the word 'shall,' to the end of line 5."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Akers-Douglas 308
Mr. Emmott 308
Sir Robert Finlay 308

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 223 ; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 265.)

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 234 ; Noes, 175. (Division List No. 266.)

And, it being half-past Six of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of July 5th, successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the business allotted to the Sitting.

Clause 5 :—

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 245 ; Noes, 181. (Division List No. 267.)

Clause 6 :—

Amendment proposed—

In page 5, line 7, after the word 'department,' to insert the words or any port sanitary authority.' " (*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Another Amendment proposed –

In page 5, line 9, after the word 'department,' to insert the words 'or authority.' " (*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, ' That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, " That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 250 ; Noes, 191. (Division List No. 268.)

Clause 7 :—

Amendment proposed—

" In page 5, line 32, to leave out the word 'landed' and insert the word 'disembark.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, " That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 248 ; Noes, 186. (Division List No. 269.)

Clause 8 :—

Mr. Fuller (Wiltshire, Westbury) 329

Amendment proposed—

" In page 6, line 15, to leave out the word 'steerage.' "—(*Mr Fuller.*)

Question proposed, " That the word 'steerage' stand part of the clause."

Sir Robert Finlay 331
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 332
Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.) 332

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Aliens Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 8 :—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 6, line 15, to leave out the word 'steerage.'"—(*Mr. Fuller.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'steerage' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Herbert Robertson (*Hackney, S.*) 333
Sir George Bartley (*Islington, N.*) 334
Mr. Forde Ridley (*Bethnal Green, S.W.*) 335
Mr. Seely (*Lincoln*) 336
Mr. Akers-Douglas 337

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 144 ; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 270.)

Mr. Marks (*Kent, Thanet*) 339

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 15, after the word 'passenger' to insert the words 'or alien member of the crew.'"—(*Mr. Marks.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Major Evans Gordon 341
Mr. Markham (*Nottinghamshire, Mansfield*) 341
Mr. Forde Ridley 341
Sir Robert Finlay 342

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Fuller 343

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 15, after the word 'passenger,' to insert the words 'not born in the United Kingdom.'"—(*Mr. Fuller.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Whitley .. 343
Mr. Akers-Douglas .. 344
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) .. 345
Mr. David MacIver .. 345
Mr. Flynn .. 346
Mr. Abel Thomas (Carmarthen, E.) .. 347
Sir Robert Finlay .. 347
Mr. William Abraham (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) .. 350
Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) .. 350
Mr. Austin Taylor .. 350
Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.) .. 351
Mr. Swift MacNeill .. 351
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) .. 352
Mr. Leif Jones .. 353
Mr. Churchill .. 353
Mr. William Abraham .. 354
Sir Robert Finlay .. 354
Mr. H. Lawson (Tower Hamlets, Mile End) .. 355
Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 356
Mr. Harwood .. 356
Mr. Akers-Douglas .. 356
Major Seely (Isle of Wight) .. 357
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) .. 357
Mr. Renwick (Newcastle-on-Tyne) .. 358
Mr. William Abraham .. 358

And, it being Midnight, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, to put the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That the words 'not born in the United Kingdom' be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 173; Noes, 214. (Division List No. 271.)

The CHAIRMAN then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the Business allotted to the Sitting.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 16, to leave out the word 'such.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 19, to leave out the words 'immediately proceeding,' and insert the words 'proceeding within a reasonable time.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 20, at end, to insert the words 'or any passengers holding prepaid through tickets to some such destination if the master or owner of the ship by which they are brought to the United Kingdom, or by which they are to be taken away from the United Kingdom, gives security to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that, except for the purposes of transit or under other circumstances approved by the Secretary of State, they will not remain in the United Kingdom, or having been rejected in another country, re-enter the United Kingdom and that they will be properly maintained and controlled during their transit.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 210 ; Noes, 161. (Division List No. 272.)

Clause 9.

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 204 ; Noes, 150. (Division List No. 273.)

Clause 10.

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee proceeded to a Division.

Sir A. Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia were appointed Tellers for the Ayes, but no Members being willing to act as Tellers for the Noes the Chairman declared the Ayes had it.

Question put, "That the Chairman do report the Bill, as amended, to the House."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 189 ; Noes, 132. (Division List No. 274.)

Bill reported, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 271.]

And, it being One of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House, without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 12TH JULY, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London County Council (Tramways) Bill [KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED].—Bill read the third time, and passed 377

Corbett Estate Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed .. 377

Central London Railway Bill (BY ORDER).—Second Readng—deferred till Wednesday next 377

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 2) Bill (BY ORDER).—Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next 377

Local Government Provisional Orders (No 12) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow 377

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 377

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order [6th July] for Committal of the Bill be read and discharged, and that the Bill be committed to a Select Committee of Nine Members, Five to be nominated by the House and Four by the Committee of Selection. That all Petitions against the Bill presented not less than four clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents, be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill. That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records. That Five be the quorum."—(*Mr. Remnant.*)

Objection being taken, the Order was deferred to to-morrow evening .. 377

PETITIONS.

CHURCHES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition of the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, against Clause 5; to lie upon the Table 378

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirty-third Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1903–4, containing the Report of the Medical Officer for 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 379

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE. Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 26th June; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 239.] 379

July 12.] *Page*

CIVIL SERVICES (ADDITIONAL ESTIMATE, 1905–6). Estimate presented, of the Amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1906, for certain Expenditure, including sundry Grants in Aid, in connection with the Relief of Distress in Ireland [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 238.] 379

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3434 and 3435 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 379

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES ACTS, 1879 AND 1884.—Address for "Return showing the working of the Regulations made in 1886 for carrying out the Prosecution of Offences Acts, 1879 and 1884, with Statistics setting forth the number, nature, result, and cost of the Proceedings instituted by the Director, in accordance with those Regulations, from the 1st day of January, 1904, to the 31st day of December, 1904 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 267 of Session 1904)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*) 379

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PROGRESS OF HARBOUR WORKS AT AVOCH, ROSS-SHIRE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 379

UTILITY OF SUBMARINES.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 380

DOCK LABOURERS' STRIKE AT LIVERPOOL.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 380

DOCK LABOURERS' STRIKE AT LIVERPOOL.—Insanitary Condition of Non-Union Labourers' Quarters.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 380

MERTHYR TYDVIL AND THE REDISTRIBUTION PROPOSALS—.Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 381

NEWPORT (MON.) AND THE REDISTRIBUTION PROPOSALS.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 382

ACCIDENTS CAUSED BY COVERED VANS.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 382

SALE OF FURNITURE, ETC., AT WALMER CASTLE.—Question, Colonel Stopford Sackville (Northamptonshire, N.); Answer, Lord Balcarres 383

SALARIES OF JUNIOR AND ASSISTANT CLERKS IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 383

MAIL SERVICE AT DUNGLOE AND BURTONPORT.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 384

ARMY RECRUITING.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 384

RULES FOR MANAGEMENT OF REGIMENTAL THEATRES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 385

EDUCATION ESTIMATES.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 385

NAVAL WORKS BILL.—DATE OF INTRODUCTION.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 385

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SUBMARINE HATCHES.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 385

LORD ROBERTS' PAY.—Questions, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E), Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Captain Norton (Newington, W.), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.), and the Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 386

MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF VOLUNTEERS.—Questions, Mr. Fuller (Wiltshire, Westbury); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 390

AMMUNITION GRANTS FOR VOLUNTEERS.—Question, Mr. Fuller; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 390

MILITARY PRISON REGULATIONS.—Questions, Mr. Bright (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 391

CANADIAN CATTLE—EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION.—Questions, Sir John Leng, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) and Mr. Spear (Devonshire, Tavistock); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwickshire and Leamington) 391

COST OF REPRESSING RIOTS IN THE RAND MINES.—Question, Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 392

THE TRANSVAAL WAR CONTRIBUTION.—Questions, Mr. Whitley (Halifax), and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 393

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE MOTOR-CAR ACT.—Questions, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 394

WATCHES NOT GOLD OR SILVER PLATE.—Question, Mr. John Campbell (Armagh, S.); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Bonar Law, Glasgow, Blackfriars) 394

SCOTTISH BOARD OF MANUFACTURES.—Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, The Lord-Advocate, Mr. Scott-Dickson (Glasgow, Bridgton) 394

KINDERGARTEN INSTRUCTION IN IRISH SCHOOLS.—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answers, Mr. Walter Long 395

MIXED SCHOOLS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 395

BANOGUE NATIONAL SCHOOL, LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 396

July 12.] Page

Croker Estate, County Limerick.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 396

Male Students at the Marlborough Street Training College.—Question, Mr. McVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 397

English Teachers in Irish Schools.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 397

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Miss Colgan.—Question, Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 397

Carriage—Horse Breeding in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 398

Tobacco-Growing in Ireland.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 398

Disappearance of Constable Masterton, Royal Irish Constabulary.—Questions, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory), Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.), Mr. John Redmond (Waterford, S.), Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary S.), and Mr. Haviland Burke (King's County, Tullamore); Answers, Mr. Walter Long 399

Constable Cryan, Royal Irish Constabulary.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 400

Administration of the Irish Land Act—Confidential Instructions.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 400

Irish Land Act, 1903—Section 5.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 401

Kerry Evicted Tenants.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 401

Dublin College of Science—Engineering School.—Questions, Mr. Mooney (Dublin County, S.); Answer, The Financial Secretary of the Treasury, (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 401

Irish National School Building Plans.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 402

Irish Land Purchase Act.—Questions, Colonel Nolan (Galway, N.); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 402

Foreign Consuls in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 403

Ireland and the Redistribution Scheme.—Questions, Mr. O'Kelly (Mayo, N.); Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent), Mr. John Redmond; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 403

The Government's Fiscal Policy.—Questions, Mr. Black (Banffshire) and Mr. John Redmond; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 408

July 12.] *Page*

SCOTTISH CHURCHES AND EDUCATION BILLS.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. John Redmond, and Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 408

THE UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN BILL.—Questions, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), Mr. Pirie, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), Mr. John Redmond, and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour and Mr. Speaker 410

THE COLLIERY EXPLOSION.—Questions, Sir Alfred Thomas (Glamorganshire, E.), Mr. Keir Hardie and Mr. William Abraham (Glamorganshire, Rhondda); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 413

THE SOUTH WALES COALFIELD.—Questions, Mr. Llewellyn (Somersetshire, N.), Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 414

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Second Report brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 240.] 415

Churches (Scotland) Bill. [SECOND READING].—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [4th July], " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

" To leave out all the words after the word ' That,' and at the end of the Question to add the words ' in the opinion of this House no approval should be given to any measure which has the effect of giving an Established Church the right to change or modify its creeds, or any formula of subscription thereto, without such change or modification being submitted to and specifically sanctioned by Parliament.' "—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question again proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Compton Rickett (Scarborough) 415
Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) 418
Mr. Thomas Shaw (Hawick Burghs) 423
Mr. Elliot (Durham) 439
Mr. Charles Douglas (Lancashire, N.W.) 442
Mr. Perks (Lincolnshire, Louth) 447
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 449
Mr. Findlay (Lanarkshire, N.E.) 458
Sir Walter Thorburn (Peebles and Selkirk) 459
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 461
Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid.) 463

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 103; Noes, 63. (Division List No. 275.)

July 12.] **Page**

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

And, there being no further Business set down for the Afternoon Sitting, Mr. Speaker left the Chair until the Evening Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means from this Evening's Sitting.

SUPPLY [JUNE 29TH].

Resolutions reported

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1905–6:

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,768,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the *Personnel* for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on March 31st, 1906."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £4,816,900, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of the *Materiel* for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on March 31st, 1906."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £7,827,800, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Contract Work for Shipbuilding, Repairs, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on March 31st, 1906."

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution.

Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 471

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out '£2,768,300,' and insert '£2,768,200'—(*Mr. Whitley.*) —instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That, '£2,768,300,' stand part of the Resolution."

The Secretary to the Admiralty (*Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge*) 472
Mr. Reginald Lucas (*Portsmouth*) 472
The Earl of Dalkeith (*Roxburgh*) 475
Mr. Spear (*Devonshire, Tavistock*) 477
Mr. Cumming Macdona (*Southwark, Rotherhithe*) 478
Sir Frederick Banbury 480

Page

Sir William Tomlinson 481
Mr. Herbert Robertson (*Hackney, S.*) 481
The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (*Mr. Arthur Lee, Hampshire, Fareham*) 482

Mr. Whitley rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 157 ; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 276.)

Question put accordingly, "That '£2,768,300' stand part of the Resolution."

The House divided :—Ayes, 115 ; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 277.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Dalziel 489
Mr. Keir Hardie 491
Mr. Pretyman 493
Mr. Kearley (*Devonport*) 498

Mr. Pretyman rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 114 ; Noes, 76. (Division List No. 278.)

Question put accordingly, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

The House divided :—Ayes, 115 ; Noes, 74. (Division List No. 279.)

Second and Third Resolutions to be further considered to-morrow.

Trade Marks (Recommitted) Bill.—Considered in Committee ; Committee report Progress ; to sit again to-morrow 503

Adjournment.—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Mr. Arthur Henderson (*Durham, Barnard Castle*) 504
Mr. Shackleton (*Lancashire, Clitheroe*) 505
Mr. J. F. Hope (*Sheffield, Brightside*) 506
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 506
Mr. Keir Hardie (*Merthyr Tydvil*) 507
Mr. Ainsworth (*Argyllshire*) 508
The Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury (*Sir A Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington*) 508
Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) 508

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 13TH JULY, 1905.

VISCOUNT HAWARDEN.—Petition of Robert Henry Maude, Viscount Hawarden in the Peerage of Ireland, claiming a right to vote at the election of Representative Peers for Ireland; read, and referred to the Lord Chancellor to consider and report thereupon to the House 509

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Rhondda Urban District Council Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Denman be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Earl of Craven; read, and agreed to 509

Rotherham, Maltby, and Laughton Railway Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 509

Midland Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 509

South Barracas (Buenos Ayres) Gas and Coke Company Bill [H.L.].—Committed 509

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill.—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 26th of June and the 4th instant discharged, and Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 509

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill; Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 1) Bill. To be read 3ª on Monday next 509

Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons .. 509

London County Council (Tramways) Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 510

Hessel Gas Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 510

Bolton Corporation Bill; Wemyss Dock Bill [H.L.]; North-Eastern Railway Bill; North-Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Ravensworth and the Lord Hindlip be proposed to the House as members of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Craven and the Lord Clinton; read, and agreed to 510

North-Eastern Railway Bill; North-Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Ludlow be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Duke of Northumberland, and that the Lord Ludlow be Chairman of the said Committee; read, and agreed to 510

July 13.] *Page*

Glasgow Corporation (Tramways Consolidation) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Glasgow Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—To be read 2ª To-morrow 510

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 510

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill..—House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 510

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 510

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3434. Argentine Republic.

No. 3435. China (Foochow). 510

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—Thirty-third Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1903–1904. Supplement containing the report of the medical officer for 1903–1904 511

ARMY (VOLUNTEERS).—Circular letter addressed to General Officers Commanding-in-Chief in substitution for the circular letter of 20th June, 1905 .. 511

NORTH SEA FISHERIES INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE.—Report on fishery and hydrographical investigations in the North Sea and adjacent waters, 1902–1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 511

EXCHEQUER AND AUDIT DEPARTMENTS ACT, 1886.—Treasury Minute, dated 10th July, 1905, requiring that the Comptroller and Auditor-General shall extend his audit of the accounts of the Crown Agents for the Colonies, hitherto restricted to the office fund, and shall verify the quarterly certificates of cash and securities held by them in trust for the Colonies 511

RULES PUBLICATION ACT, 1893.—No. 220. Additional Rule.
Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.. 511

Coal Mines (Weighing of Minerals) Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Newton 511

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Newton.*)

Lord Belper 512

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

July 13.] *Page*

Public Meetings (Facilities) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow.

DISSEMINATION OF NEWS IN WAR TIME.

Lord Ellenborough 512
The Secretary for Scotland (The Marquess of Linlithgow) 518

THE IVEAGH PIRRIE MOTOR-CAR SCHEME.

Lord Killanin 518
The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (The Marquess of Londonderry) 520

THE SEIZURE OF BRITISH VESSELS.

Lord Muskerry 522
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 522
Viscount Sidmouth 524

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

Lord James of Hereford 524
The Marquess of Lansdowne 526
The Earl of Ranfurly 527

BRITISH TRADERS IN THE MARSHALL AND CAROLINE ISLANDS.

The Earl of Jersey 527
The Marquess of Lansdowne 528

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 13TH JULY, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [LORDS] (King's consent signified).—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 529

Tees Valley Water Board Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 529

Whitby Urban District Council Bill [LORDS] (King's Consent signified).—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 529

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 530

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time to-morrow 530

Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment (Vincent Square) Bill.—Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment (Vincent Square) Bill with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills. 530

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).—Ordered, That Captain J. Whitley Dixon do attend the Committee on Group L of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock 530

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 530

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 530

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill [LORDS]; Workington Harbour and Dock Bill [Lords]; Shepton Mallet Gas Company (Electric Lighting) Bill [Lords]; South Lancashire Tramways Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. 530

Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Acton District) Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 531

Formby Township Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 531

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Agricultural Rates Act, 1896, etc., Continuance Bill; Millport Piers and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill, without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Bradford Corporation Tramways, Gorton Urban District Council Tramways, Keighley Corporation Tramways, Leeds Corporation Tramways, Liverpool Corporation Tramways Extensions, and Pudsey Corporation Tramways." [Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords.] 531

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 272.] 531

July 13.] Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NORTH SEA FISHERIES INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE.—Copy presented, of Report on Fishery and Hydrographical Investigations in the North Sea and Adjacent Waters, 1902–3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 532

CROWN AGENTS.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 10th July, 1905, requiring the Comptroller and Auditor-General to extend his audit of the Accounts of the Crown Agents for the Colonies, hitherto restricted to the Office Fund, and to verify the Quarterly Certificates of Cash and Securities held by them in trust for the Colonies [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 532

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

NAVAL BARRACK THEATRES.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 532

FINES IN THE SASINE OFFICE, EDINBURGH.—Question, Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid); Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 533

SCOTTISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD'S FUNDS.—Question, Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire); Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 533

PAUPERISM IN POPLAR.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 533

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 534

AGED PAUPERS IN SCOTTISH POORHOUSES.—Question, Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 534

MOTOR-CARS IN KING'S PARK, EDINBURGH.—Question, Sir Lewis McIver (Edinburgh, W.); Answer, Lord Balcarres 535

ADRIANOPLE REFUGEES IN BULGARIA.—Question, Sir A. Hayter (Walsall); Answer, Earl Percy 535

THROWING DOGS IN THE THAMES—ALLEGED CRUELTY.—Question, Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 536

ALLOWANCES TO PROVINCIAL POSTMEN.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 536

ALIEN IMMIGRATION RETURNS.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Bonar Low 536

IRISH EDUCATION IN EXTRA SUBJECTS.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 537

IRISH EDUCATION CODE.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 537

PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN IRISH RURAL DISTRICTS.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 538

July 13.]

Page

FLOODS AT WESTPORT, COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 538

EVICTED TENANTS IN COUNTY WATERFORD.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 539

SOUTH AFRICAN HORSE DISEASE.—Question, Mr. Power; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 539

LISMORE SHOW—PROHIBITION OF MOVEMENT OF HORSES FROM AND INTO COUNTY WATERFORD.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long.. 540

CASE OF MR. WILLIAM DAVIES OF DOMINICA.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 540

LABOURERS IN SOUTH AFRICAN MINES.—Question, Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 641

ARMY BAND INSTRUMENTS.—Question, Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney), Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 541

NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND PLAIN CLOTHES.—Question, Mr. Colston (Gloucestershire, Thornbury); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 541

SLEEPING ACCOMMODATION FOR SOLDIERS ON GUARD.—Question, Mr. Colston; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 542

VOLUNTEER MUSKETRY REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 542

ROMFORD VOLUNTEER ARTILLERY.—Question, Mr. Lewis Sinclair (Essex, Romford); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 543

NAVAL WORKS BILL.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 543

IRISH PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATIONS.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 543

SUBMARINE VESSELS IN WAR.—Question, Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 544

THE WAR STORES COMMISSION ACT.—Question, Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 544

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

DEAL BARRACKS THEATRE.—Questions, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answers, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Arthur Lee, Hampshire, Fareham) .. 545

PERCENTAGES OF MARKSMEN.—Question, Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 546

VOLUNTEER MARKSMEN.—Question, Mr. Frederick Wilson (Norfolk, Mid); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 546

July 13.] Page

Bordon Military Camp.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 546

Chinese Attacks on Whites on the Rand.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 547

Railway Development in Northern Nigeria.—Question, Mr. Emmott (Oldham); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 547

Flogging of Chinese Coolies in Transvaal Mines.—Questions, Mr. Bright (Shropshire, Oswestry) and Mr. Burt (Morpeth); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton .. 548

Zionists in South Africa.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 549

Cruelty to a Native at the Crœsus Gold Mine.—Question, Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 550

The Banishment of Madho Singh.—Questions, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.), Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), and Mr. Weir; Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 550

Consular Reports on Irish Trade.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 551

Zervi Outrages.—Question, Mr. Lyell (Dorsetshire, E.); Answer, Earl Percy .. 552

Sale of Poisons to Agriculturists.—Questions, Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answers, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes, Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) 552

Canadian Cattle (Dundee).—Question, Sir John Leng; Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 553

Plural Voters.—Questions, Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) .. 554

North Eastern Railway—Accidents Caused by Electrically Charged Rails.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Bonar Law, Glasgow, Blackfriars) 554

Civil Servants and Members of Parliament.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 554

Assistant Clerks for the Government Service.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, The Financial Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 555

Special Police Courts for.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustines) 555

July 13.] *Page*

VACCINATION EXEMPTIONS.—Questions, Mr. Weir, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mooney (Dublin, County S.), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) and Sir George Bartley (Islington, N.) 556

ASSAULTS ON THE LONDON POLICE.—Questions, Mr. Haviland Burke (King's County, Tullamore), Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny) and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, Mr. Akers-Douglas 558

COMPENSATION TO INJURED POLICEMEN.—Questions, Mr. Haviland Burke, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.) and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 559

STREET TRADING BY GIRLS.—Question, Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 560

ATTACKS ON WARDERS AT PRINCETOWN.—Question, Mr. Spear (Devonshire, Tavistock) 561

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, The Lord-Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) .. ..

BEAUFORT CASTLE SHOOTING OUTRAGE.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Weir; Answers, Mr. Scott-Dickson 562

IRISH LAND JUDGE'S COURT.—Question, Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.) and Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 563

LAND PURCHASE AGREEMENTS.—Questions, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.) and Mr. John (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Walter Long 564

REINSTATEMENT OF EVICTED TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Power (Waterford, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 564

CHARGE AGAINST GURTEEN CONSTABLES.—Question, Mr. Reddy (King's County, Birr); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 566

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEES' REPORT.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury, Mr. A. J. Balfour (Manchester, E.) 567

EVICTIONS IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 567

KING'S LYNN AND THE REDISTRIBUTION PROPOSALS.—Questions, Mr. Frederick Wilson; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour. 568

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.—Questions, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 568

THE UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN BILL.—Questions, Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle), Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe), Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), Mr. Lough, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), and Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 570

July 13.] **Page**

REDISTRIBUTION.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), Mr. Gibson Bowles, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Sir Charles Diilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answers, Mr. Speaker and Mr. A. J. Balfour 577

SUPPLY [14TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,220,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Capitation Grants and Miscellaneous Charges of Volunteer Corps, including Pay, etc., of the Permanent Staff, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on March 31st, 1906."

Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) 580

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,219,900, be granted for the said Service."

Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 588
Mr. C. R. Spencer (*Northants, Mid.*) 594
Colonel Denny (*Kilmarnock Burghs*) 597
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (*Bristol, E.*) 600
Lord Bingham (*Surrey, Chertsey*) 605
Major Seely (*Isle of Wight*) 607
Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore 610
Sir Arthur Hayter (*Walsall*) 612
Major Evans Gordon (*Tower Hamlets, Stepney*) 614
Mr. Fuller (*Wiltshire, Westbury*) 617
Sir Gilbert Parker (*Gravesend*) 617
Mr. Churchill (*Oldham*) 620
The Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Arnold-Foster, Belfast, W.*) 622

Question put—

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 206; Noes, 232. (Division List No. 280.)

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY [14TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £545,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the War Office and Army Accounts Department, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906."

Mr. Arnold-Forster 646
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 664

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries and Allowances of the War Office) be reduced by £100"—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

Mr. Buchanan (*Perthshire, E.*) 666
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (*Shropshire, Newport*) 670
Colonel Welby (*Taunton*) 674
Mr. Churchill 674
Mr. Hunt (*Shropshire, Ludlow*) 680

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 132 ; Noes, 169. (Division List No. 281.)

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS : FRIDAY, 14TH JULY, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Wemyss Dock Bill [H.L.].—Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee 685

Dublin, Wicklow and Wexford Railway Bill ; Worcestershire County Council (Bridges) Bill.—Read 3ª, and passed 685

Earl of Stamford's Cheshire Estate Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 685

July 14.] Page

Skegness Water Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed and returned to the Commons 685

Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 685

Tees Valley Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Whitby Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 685

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 685

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next 685

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill.—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next 685

Glasgow Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to Order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3ª on Monday next 685

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill (No. 139); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill (No. 140).—Brought from the Commons; read 1a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners .. 685

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3436. Brazil (Pará) 686

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade. (County of Middlesex Light Railways (Extension of Time) Order, 1905), amending the County of Middlesex Light Railways Order, 1901. (North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways (Light Railway) Order, 1905 authorising the working and maintenance of the Moel Tryfan Undertaking of the North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways Company as a light railway, and other matters.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 686

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury Minute, dated 8th July, 1905, declaring Bushire to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, 1876 686

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (BOROUGH OF DARWEN).—Order made by the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Darwen, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for hairdressers' and barbers' shops within the borough 686

COURT OF PROBATE DIVISION (HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE (IRELAND).—Account of receipts and disbursements, for the year ended December 31st, 1904.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 686

NEW BILL.

County Courts (Ireland) Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the law relating to County Courts in Ireland. Was presented by the Lord Ashbourne; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next. (No. 138.)

THE IRISH LAND ACT.

The Earl of Dunraven .. 687
Lord Clonbrock .. 702
The Earl of Mayo .. 705
Lord Oranmore and Browne .. 707
The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (The Marquess of Londonderry) .. 710
The Earl of Westmeath .. 717

Convocations of the Clergy Bill [H.L.].—[SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury .. 719

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

Earl Spencer .. 721
Lord Coleridge .. 723
Lord Heneage .. 723
Lord James of Hereford .. 724
Lord Stanley of Alderley .. 726
Lord Bishop of St. Albans .. 727
Lord Tweedmouth .. 729
Lord Stanmore .. 730
The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) .. 732
Earl Spencer .. 732

Amendment moved—

"That the debate stand adjourned."—(*The Earl of Feversham.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to and further debate adjourned *sine die.*

Drunkenness (Ireland) Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Mayo .. 733

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Mayo.*)

The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) .. 733

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

July 14.] Page

Public Meetings (Facilities) Bill [H.L.]—[THIRD READING].—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Lord Burghclere.*)

The Earl of Feversham 733

On question, Bill read 3ª. Drafting Amendments made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 14TH JULY, 1905.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Andover Lighting and Power Bill; Great Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 734

Gosport and Fareham Tramways Bill [LORDS]; Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 734

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [LORDS]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 734

North East London Railway Bill; London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 735

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next 735

Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 735

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for the settlement of the hereditaments and property representing the estates devised by the Will, dated the 26th day of June, 1875, of the Right Honourable George Harry, Earl of Stamford and Warrington, and in such Will referred to as 'the Cheshire Estate'; and for other purposes." [Earl of Stamford's Cheshire Estate Bill [Lords] 735

Earl of Stamford's Cheshire Estate Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 735

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the County of Middlesex Light Railways Order, 1901 (County of Middlesex Light Railways (Extension of Time) Order, 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 735

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the working and maintenance of the Moel Tryfan Undertaking of the North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways Company as a Light Railway and other matters (North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways (Light Railway) Order, 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 736

Court of Probate Division (High Court of Justice) (Ireland).—Annual Account presented, of Receipts and Disbursements for the year ended 31st December, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 736

Superannuation Acts, 1858 and 1876.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 8th July, 1905, declaring Bushire to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of The Superannuation Act, 1876 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 736

Prosecution of Offences Acts, 1879 and 1884.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 12th July; *Mr. Cochrane*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 241] 736

Shop Hours Act, 1904 (Closing Order, Borough of Darwen).—Copy presented, of Order made by the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Darwen, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for Hairdressers' and Barbers' Shops within the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 736

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3436 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 736

Joint Stock Companies.—Return ordered, "(I.) of the Companies registered during the year ended the 31st day of December, 1904, which filed a prospectus and to which certificates to commence business have been granted, stating—

(1) The date of registration.

(2) The date of the prospectus.

(3) The amount of the nominal capital.

(4) The amount of each share.

(5) The amount issued or to be issued otherwise than for cash.

(6) The amount offered for subscription in cash.

July 14.] *Page*

(7) the amount underwritten ;

(8) the commission for underwriting ;

(9) the minimum subscription required ;

(10) the amount allotted before commencing business ;

(11) the amounts per share payable on application and allotment ;

(12) the total directors' share qualification, if any ; and

(13) the date of the certificate to commence business.

(II.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1904 which filed a prospectus, but to which certificates to commence business have not been granted, stating the particulars specified in (I.) so far as they are applicable.

(III.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1904 which filed a declaration that the Company "does not issue any invitation to the public to subscribe for its shares."

(IV.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1904 which have not filed a prospectus or a declaration that the Company "does not issue any invitation to the public to subscribe for its shares," and stating the particulars specified in (I.) so far as they are applicable.

(V.) Of the Companies which were dissolved or struck off the register during the year 1904.

(VI.) Of the total number of Companies dissolved during the year 1904 (1) by order of the Court ; (2) after voluntary liquidation ; and (3) pursuant to the provisions of Section 7 of the Companies Act, 1880, and Section 26 of the Companies Act, 1900.

(VII.) Of the total number and nominal paid-up and considered as paid-up capital of the Companies registered during the year 1904 in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin respectively, distinguishing limited Companies from unlimited, and Companies registered with a nominal capital from Companies registered without such capital.

(VIII.) Of the total number and paid-up capital, including the amounts considered as paid on vendors and other shares, of all Companies having a share capital which were on the register on the 30th day of April, 1905, except such Companies as were in course of liquidation or removal from the register under the provisions of Section 7 of The Companies Act, 1880, and Section 26 of the Companies Act, 1900.

(IX.) Of the total number and nominal capital of the Companies registered in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively in every year since the commencement of the Companies Act, 1862, to 1904, inclusive.

(X.) Of the fees and capital duty paid in respect of Registered Companies during the year 1904."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*) 736

July 14.] *Page*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

THE UNEMPLOYED AT PORTSMOUTH.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 739

INTERNATIONAL JUDICIAL CONGRESS—GAMBLING IN FUTURES.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 739

GAMBLING OPERATIONS IN COTTON.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 740

REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON SEWAGE DISPOSAL.—Question, Col. Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 740

ASSISTANT POSTMEN.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 741

POST OFFICE—ANNUAL LEAVE TO OFFICERS ABOUT TO RETIRE.—Question, Mr. Mac-Veagh; Answer, Lord Stanley 741

THE BOARD OF TRADE AND MR. BROWN'S INVENTION.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Bonar Law 741

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS—MESSRS. VAYGOOD AND THE FAIR WAGES CLAUSE.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Lord Balcarres .. 742

PAYMENT OF ANNUAL EDUCATIONAL GRANT BY QUARTERLY INSTALMENTS.—Question, Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.); Answer, Sir William Anson 743

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 743

RENTAL OF SOLD AND UNSOLD PORTION OF THE KING-HARMAN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 743

ADVANCES EXCEEDING £3,000 ON THE KING-HARMAN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 744

WOOLWICH DOCKYARD BUILDING CONTRACT—MESSRS. PLAYFAIR AND THE FAIR WAGES CLAUSE.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 744

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR HONOURS FOR ARMY MEDICAL CORPS (VOLUNTEERS).—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 745

Education (Scotland) Bill.—On the Order to go into Committee on this Bill.

Mr. Black (Banffshire) 745
Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid) 746

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

July 14.] *Page*

[Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 :—

Lord Willoughby de Eresby (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) 747

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, to leave out the words, 'of the following education districts,' and insert the word 'country.'"—(*Lord Willoughby de Eresby.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Sir Charles Renshaw (Renfrew, W.) 749
The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 750
Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire) 750
Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 751
The Earl of Dalkeith (Roxburgh) 752
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 753
Mr. Maxwell (Dumfriesshire) 755
Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire) 756
Mr. Black 756
Mr. Thomas Shaw (Hawick Burghs) 757
Mr. Caldwell 759
Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross) 762
Lord Willoughby de Eresby 762
Mr. Brigg (Yorks, W.R., Keighley) 763
Mr. Hunter Craig (Lanarkshire, Govan) 763
Mr. Dobbie (Ayr Burghs) 764
Mr. Black 764

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 148 ; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 282)

Mr. Caldwell 765

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, to leave out from the word 'each,' to the end of line 24, and insert the words 'parish and burgh in Scotland.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Eugene Wason 773
Mr. Scott Dickson 773
Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) 776
Mr. Ainsworth 777
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) 778
Mr. Thomas Shaw (Hawick Burghs) 779

Sir Mark Stewart (*Kirkcudbrightshire*) 780
Mr. Dobbie 781
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 782
Mr. Parker Smith (*Lanarkshire, Partick*) 784
Mr. Findlay (*Lanarkshire, N.E.*) 786
Mr. Haldane (*Haddingtonshire*) 786
Mr. George White (*Norfolk, N.W.*) 787
Mr. Buchanan 788

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 130 ; Noes, 67. (Division List No. 283.)

Mr. Black 791

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 6, after the word 'board' to insert the words 'or from a parish council.' "—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Scott Dickson 792
Mr. Black 793

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 14, at the end to insert the words, 'Provided further that an order made under this section shall not come into force until one month after the same has been published in at least one newspaper circulating in the neighbourhood affected by the order during which period it shall be competent for any local authority or any twenty ratepayers within or bordering upon the area affected by such order to present a requisition for a hearing thereon, and on receiving such a requisition the Secretary for Scotland shall appoint a convenient time and place for hearing parties, and he shall then and there, either by himself or by a proper person as his depute, hear parties as to such order, and shall at his sole discretion or at the sole discretion of his depute receive evidence written or oral and shall determine in the matter as may seem just.' "—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Mr. Caldwell 793
Mr. Scott Dickson 794

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. Black 796

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 14, at the end, to insert the words, 'provided further that in considering as to dividing a local Government district into education districts under this section the Secretary for Scotland shall as far as possible preserve the school board districts under the

heretofore existing law or such aggregations thereof as may for educational purposes solely seem best, keeping in view not only population and area but also means of communication with a convenient centre for secondary education and the efficiency of the facilities heretofore provided in the existing school board district for secondary as well as elementary education."—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Scott Dickson 797
Mr. Thomas Shaw 797
Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire) 798

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 69 ; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 284.)

And, it being after half-past Five of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Monday next.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 17TH JULY, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills :—London Government Scheme (Hackney and Edmonton Unions) ; London Government Scheme (London and Middlesex) ; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—London County Council (Tramways).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 801

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—(Aberavon Tramways Order). The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Aberavon Tramways Order. Ordered, That the Order be not further proceeded with 801

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow 801

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 801

July 17.] *Page*

South Barracas (Buenos Ayres) Gas and Coke Company Bill [H.L.].—Committee to meet to-morrow 801

North Eastern Railway Bill; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Ellenborough be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Ravensworth: read, and agreed to 801

Dover Harbour Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to order) 802

Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill; Dublin United Tramways Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 802

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 802

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 802

Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 802

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 1) Bill.—Third Reading (which stands appointed for this day), put off to Friday next .. 802

Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bill.—Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 72, 82, and 85 be suspended for the remainder of the session 802

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 802

Gosport and Fareham Tramways Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 802

Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [H.L.]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 802

Andover Lighting and Power Bill; Great Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 802

Edinburgh Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. (No. 141.)—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Edinburgh Corporation. And 802

Stonehaven Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. (No. 142.)—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Stonehaven Harbour. Were presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow; read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Section 7) deemed to have been read 2ª; and reported from the Committee 803

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 143.) 803

July 17.] *Page*

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 16) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 17) Bill.—Moved, That the order made on the 16th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bills read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow 803

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—Read 3^a (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons .. 803

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill.—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed. 803

London County Council (Tramways) Bill.

Lord Newton 803
The Chairman of Committees 804

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).—Further Papers regarding the administration of the Army in India (in continuation of [Cd. 2572]) 804

PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND).—Report to the Local Government Board for Scotland on the sanitary condition of the Island of Lewis 804

TRADE REPORTS—(ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3437. Turkey (Damascus).

No. 3438. Italy (Ancona).

No. 3439. Portugal (Lourenço Marques) 804

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES.

1. Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England and Wales (1904).

2. Supplement to Sixty-fifth Annual Report. Part 1.

3. Supplement to Sixty-fifth Annual Report. Part II.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 805

WINTER ASSIZES ACT, 1876.—Seven Orders in Council of the 11th July, 1905, relating to the ensuing winter Assizes 805

COLONIAL PRISONERS REMOVAL ACT, 1884.—Order in Council of July 11th, 1905, applying the Colonial Prisoners Removal Act, 1884, to the East Africa Protectorate 805

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876, AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACTS.—Order in Council of July 11th, 1905, varying the Order in Council of March 25th, 1877, relating to day industrial schools 805

July 17.] *Page*

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Order in Council of 11th July, 1905, constituting Burntisland a port of registry for British sea-fishing boats.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 805

INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).

The Marquess of Ripon 805
The Under-Secretary of State for India (*The Marquess of Bath*) .. 805

THE ADMIRALTY STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Lord Brassey 807
The Secretary for Scotland (*The Marquess of Linlithgow*) 813

ARMY YEOMANRY.

Lord Wenlock 815

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers relating to the mobilisation and training of the Imperial Yeomanry."—(*Lord Wenlock.*)

Lord Harris 918
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) ..822
Lord Lovat 827
Earl Spencer 830
Lord Wenlock 831

On Question, Motion agreed to; and ordered accordingly.

ARMY ORGANISATION.

The Earl of Wemyss 833
The Earl of Donoughmore 833
Lord Harris 835
The Earl of Wemyss 835

EPIZOOTIC LYMPHANGITIS.

Lord Burghclere 836
The Earl of Donoughmore 838
Lord Wolverton 840
Earl Spencer 841
The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (*The Marquess of Londonderry*) 843
Lord Tweedmouth 844

Drunkenness (Ireland) Bill.—House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

July 17.] Page

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 1 to 3, to leave out the words 'or anyone holding the commission of the peace of the borough or county in which the alleged habitual drunkard resides.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2:—

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 21 to 23, to leave out the words, 'or anyone holding the commission of the peace of the borough or county in which the alleged habitual drunkard resides.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4:—

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 10 agreed to.

Clause 11:—

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 39, after the word 'month' to insert the words, 'Provided that no person shall be liable to conviction under this section unless the Court is satisfied that he knew, or ought to have known, the drunken condition of the person in respect of whom the charge is brought.'"—(*The Marquess of Londonderry.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 11, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 12, agreed to.

Clause 13:—

Lord Ludlow 845

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 8, to leave out the words, 'and, save when a defendant, a compellable.'"—(*Lord Ludlow.*)

The Earl of Mayo 846
Lord Ludlow 846
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 847

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 14 agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended (No. 144.)

Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies) Bill.—House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of Onslow in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Lord Ludlow 847

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 16 to 25, to leave out Sub-section (4), and to insert '(4) the words "person applying" in this section shall include an employer who has paid compensation or against whom a claim for compensation has been made under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, as amended by any subsequent enactment, if he shows the Judge that he probably is or will become entitled to be indemnified under that Act, and in such case this section shall apply as if the employer were the person claiming damages in respect of personal injuries.' "—(*Lord Ludlow.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 145.)

House adjourned at five minutes before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 17TH JULY, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 848

Canals (No. 2) Bill (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred pursuant to the Order of the House of the 10th July, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Canals No. 2) Bill 849

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT (1868) AMENDMENT (VINCENT SQUARE) BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO NOT COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred pursuant to the Order of the House of the 13th July, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have not been complied with, viz.:—Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment (Vincent Square) Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 849

Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [LORDS.]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 849

Thames Conservancy Bill.—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 849

Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [Lords]; Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways Bill [Lords]; Rhymney and Aber Valley Gas and Water Company Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed .. 849

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed 849

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill; Worcestershire County Council (Bridges) Bill, without Amendment.

Skegness Water Bill, with Amendments 849

Amendments to—Tees Valley Water Board Bill [Lords]; Whitby Urban District Council Bill [Lords], without Amendment 850

July 17.] *Page*

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for granting the use of Schoolrooms for Public Meetings." [Public Meetings (Facilities) Bill [Lords] 850

PETITION.

CHURCHES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Kirkcaldy, for alterations; to lie upon the Table 850

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).—Copy presented, of Further Papers regarding the Administration of the Army in India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 850

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th July; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 242] 850

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 11th July, 1905, constituting Burntisland a Port of Registry for British Sea Fishing Boats [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 850

WINTER ASSIZES ACTS, 1876 AND 1877.—Copy presented, of Seven Orders in Council of 11th July, 1905, relating to the ensuing Winter Assizes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 850

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876, AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACTS.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 11th July, 1905, varying the Order in Council of 25th March, 1877, relating to Day Industrial Schools [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 850

COLONIAL PRISONERS REMOVAL ACT, 1884.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 11th July, 1905, applying The Colonial Prisoners Removal Act, 1884, to the East Africa Protectorate [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 851

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (ENGLAND).—Copy presented, of Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Registrar-General, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 851

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (ENGLAND).—Copy presented, of Supplement to the Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Registrar-General, Part I. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 851

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (ENGLAND).—Copy presented, of Supplement to the Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Registrar-General, Part II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 851

PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Report to the Local Government Board for Scotland on the Sanitary Condition of the Island of Lewis [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 851

GROSS DEPARTMENTAL EXPENDITURE.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 4th May; *Mr. Gibson Bowles*]; to lie upon the Table 851

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3437 to 3439 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 851

July 17.] *Page*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

THE LIVERPOOL DOCK STRIKE—SMOKING BY WORKMEN.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Bonar Law 851

STEAM AND COMPRESSED AIR SYRENS ROUND THE COAST OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.—Question, Major Jameson (Clare, W.); Answer, Mr. Bonar Law .. 853

HYDE PARK DEMONSTRATION ON 9TH JULY—DELAY IN TRAFFIC.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 853

POTTERY MANUFACTURE—LEADLESS GLAZE.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 854

DEATHS FROM ACCIDENTS IN MINES.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel,(Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 855

FEES OF PUBLIC VACCINATORS.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 855

PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES.—Question. Mr. Toulmin (Bury, Lancashire); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 855

LISBURN POSTAL SERVICE—PROMOTION OF LOCAL MEN.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 856

REINSTATEMENT OF ORPHANS OF LATE THOMAS DURKAN ON THE O'CONOR (FLOGHENA) ESTATE, COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 856

UNTENANTED LAND ON THE ARMSTRONG ESTATE, COUNTY SLIGO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 857

IRISH TRANSIT RATE FOR COAL.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 858

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 858

IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 858

CANADIAN PREFERENTIAL TARIFF FOR SOUTH AFRICAN WINE.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 859

ASSISTANT CLERKS IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Butcher (York); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 859

SALARY AND OVERTIME OF ASSISTANT CLERKS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE.—Questions, Mr. Nannetti and Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham); Answers, Mr. Victor Cavendish 859

FRANCE AND GERMANY AND THE CONFERENCE RELATIVE TO MOROCCO-ANGLO-FRENCH CONVENTION.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Earl Percy 861

July 17.] *Page*

CHINESE LABOUR IN BRITISH NORTH BORNEO.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Earl Percy 861

TAX IN QUEBEC ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS AND AGENTS FOR FIRMS OUTSIDE CANADA.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 862

PAY OF SOUTHAMPTON TELEGRAPH CLERKS AND SORTERS.—Question, Mr. Tankerville Chamberlayne (Southampton); Answer, Lord Stanley 862

LEICESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS—EXCURSION OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE YEARS OF AGE.—Question, Sir Charles McLaren (Leicestershire, Bosworth); Answer, Sir William Anson 864

TEMPORARY ALTERATION OF SCHOOL TIME-TABLE.—Question, Mr. Ernest Gray; Answer, Sir William Anson 863

WATFORD GRAMMAR SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answer, Sir William Anson 864

MOTOR BOAT "PIONEER"—SUGGESTED CALL AT WICK.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 864

ISSUE OF MIDWIFERY ORDERS BY RELIEVING OFFICERS.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 864

MOTOR-CARS ON THE CONTINENT.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 865

PRESENCE OF BRITISH ADMIRAL AT A SPANISH BULL FIGHT.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. Pretyman .. 865

STATION SERGEANTS OF THE DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 866

LENGTH OF SERVICE OF CHIEF INSPECTOR OF GYMNASIA.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 866

EAST HAM EDUCATIONAL DIFFICULTY.—Question, Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 866

IRISH ACT OF UNION AND THE REDISTRIBUTION PROPOSALS.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 867

THE UNEMPLOYED BILL.—Question, Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 867

THE UNEMPLOYED BILL—SUGGESTED AUTUMN SESSION.—Question, Mr. Tankerville Chamberlayne; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 867

TRAWLING IN SCOTCH WATERS.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 868

July 17.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SEAMEN'S DEBTS.—Question, Mr. McFadden (Donegal, E.); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Arthur Lee, Fareham, Hants) 868

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF THE VOLUNTEERS.—Questions, Major Seely (Isle of Wight), and Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield, S.) 869

VOLUNTEER MUSKETRY EFFICIENCY.—Question, Mr. McCrae; Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 870

THE CONFERENCE WITH VOLUNTEER OFFICERS.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 870

THE MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF VOLUNTEERS.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent, and Mr. McCrae; Answers, Mr. Bromley Davenport 871

INDIAN ARMY ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 871

MOROCCO CONFERENCE.—Questions, Mr. Disraeli (Cheshire, Altrincham) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 873

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 873

IRELAND AND THE ALIENS BILL.—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.), and Captain Donelan (Cork, E.); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 874

ACCIDENTS TO CHILDREN IN LONDON STREETS.—Question, Mr. Samuel Smith (Flintshire); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 874

CRUELTY TO DOGS AT LAMBERT STAIRS.—Question, Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 875

DOVER AND THE IMMIGRATION BILL.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury), and Mr. Emmott (Oldham); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 875

HALLESLEY BAY HARBOUR COLONY.—Questions, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, Mr. Flynn, and Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University); Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) .. 876

SECRET COMMISSIONS PAID BY PARLIAMENTARY AGENTS—ACTION OF THE HOLBORN BOROUGH COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Benn (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 877

MOTOR-CAR ACT INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Brooke Robinson (Dudley); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 878

ALIEN PAUPERS IN ENGLAND AND WALES.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland), Sir William Tomlinson (Preston), and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. Gerald Balfour 878

July 17.] *Page*

GOVAN AND THE REDISTRIBUTION SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Hunter Craig (Lanarkshire, Govan); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 879

THE REDISTRIBUTION SCHEME.—Questions, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), and Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent); Answers, Mr. Gerald Balfour 879

REDISTRIBUTION—COST OF THE BOUNDARY COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 881

ALIEN POPULATION.—Question, Mr. Stuart Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Bonar Law, Glasgow, Blackfriars) 881

PASSENGER RATES FROM THE CONTINENT.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel; Answer, Mr. Bonar Law 882

THE UNITED STATES AND ALIENS.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel; Answer, Mr. Bonar Law 882

HYDE PARK, CLEANSING OF THE CARRIAGE DRIVE.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 882

CHURCHES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) .. 883

USE OF THE TRUNCHEON BY IRISH POLICEMEN.—Questions, Mr. Muldoon (Donegal, N.), Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway), Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory), Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.), and Mr. Haviland Burke (King's County, Tullamore); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 884

IRISH LORD CHANCELLOR'S SALARY.—Question, Mr. Muldoon; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 884

ASSISTANT LAW ADVISER OF THE IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—Question, Mr. Muldoon; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 885

CONSTABLE MASTERTON, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Questions, Mr. Delany, Mr. Haviland Burke, Mr. Charles Devlin, and Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 885

PROMOTION IN THE IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 887

LISNEMAINE, COUNTY CAVAN, EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 887

RE-INSTATEMENT OF EVICTED TENANTS IN COUNTY CAVAN.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 887

AMALGAMATION OF BOYS' AND GIRLS' SCHOOLS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 887

DUBLIN POLICE REPORT.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 888

July 17.]

Page

RE-INSTATEMENT OF EVICTED TENANTS BY THE ESTATES COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 888

THE IRISH LAND JUDGE'S COURT.—Questions, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 888

LAND PURCHASE AT ABBEYFEALE, COUNTY LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 889

CRIME IN COUNTY LIMERICK.—Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 890

NORTH OF IRELAND POSTAL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Doogan (Tyrone, E.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 891

COOKSTOWN TELEPHONE ARRANGEMENTS.—Questions, Mr. Doogan and Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, Lord Stanley 891

LATE LETTERS FOR THE LIMERICK NIGHT MAIL.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Lord Stanley 892

WILTSHIRE AND THE RE-DISTRIBUTION SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Fuller (Wiltshire, Westbury); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 893

IRELAND AND THE RE-DISTRIBUTION BILL.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), Mr. John Redmond, Mr. T. W. Russell, and Sir George Bartley (Islington, N.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 894

THE UNEMPLOYED BILL.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 896

THE RE-DISTRIBUTION RESOLUTIONS.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Gibson Bowles, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, and Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answers, Mr. Speaker and Mr. A. J. Balfour 896

MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT FOR HOLIDAYS.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 900

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—SUGGESTED AUTUMN SESSION.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 901

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Henry Liddell, Esquire, for the County of Down (West Down Division) 902

Advertisements Regulations Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 273.] 902

Public Meetings (Facilities) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 274.] 902

Carts (Ireland) Bill.—"To provide for the use of Irish characters in the names of owners painted on carts," presented by Mr. Boland; supported by Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. Lundon, and Mr. O'Malley; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 275.] 902

Relief of Released Prisoners Bill.—" To make better provision as to the relief of Persons released from Prison," presented by Major Seely; supported by Sir Barrington Simeon; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 276.] 903

Aliens Bill.—As amended, considered.

Mr. Emmott (Oldham) 903

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 6, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. Emmott.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'elsewhere,' in line 11, stand part of the Bill."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 904
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 904

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 228; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 285.)

Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool Exchange) 909

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 11, to leave out the word 'elsewhere' and insert the words 'at such other convenient place in the discretion of the immigration officer as he may appoint.'"—(*Mr. Charles McArthur.*)—instead thereof—

Question proposed, "That the word 'elsewhere' stand part of the Bill"

Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice 912
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 912
Mr. Akers-Douglas 912
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) 913

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 20, to leave out from the word 'that' to the word 'give' in line 21, and insert the words 'leave to land should not be withheld under this Act.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland) 919

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 28, after the word 'any,' to insert the words 'or that he will be supported by relatives.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) .. 919
Mr. Dalziel .. 920
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice .. 920
Major Seely (Isle of Wight) .. 920

Question put and negatived.

Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) .. 921
Mr. Bell (Derby) .. 923

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 10, at the end, to insert the words '(e) If he is being brought into this country under contract to take the place of workmen during a trade dispute.' "—(*Mr. Keir Hardie.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Mr. Akers-Douglas .. 923
Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) .. 924
Mr. John Wilson (Durham, Mid.) .. 925
Mr. Marks (Kent, Thanet) .. 927
Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston) .. 927
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) .. 929
Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) .. 931
Mr. Charles Wilson (Hull, W.) .. 932
Mr. David MacIver (Liverpool, Kirkdale) .. 933
Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough) .. 933
Mr. Dalziel .. 933
Mr. Duke (Plymouth) .. 935
Mr. Emmott .. 936
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. 937
Sir Robert Finlay .. 937
Mr. Harwood .. 938

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 163 ; Noes, 230. (Division List No. 287.)

Sir Charles Dilke .. 943

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 12, to leave out from the word 'country,' to the word 'leave,' in line 13, and insert the words 'for political reasons' "—(*Sir Charles Dilke*)— instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'solely to avoid prosecution,' stand part of the Bill."

Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice .. 944
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) .. 946
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) .. 948

July 17.] Page

Lord Hugh Cecil (*Greenwich*) 950
Sir Robert Finlay 951
Mr. Rufus Isaacs (*Reading*) 951

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 244 ; Noes, 162. (Division List No. 288.)

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 12, after the word 'prosecution,' to insert the words, "or punishment on religious grounds or' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 13, after the word 'character,' to insert the words 'or persecution, involving danger of imprisonment or danger to life or limb, on account of religious belief.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Akers-Douglas 955
Major Evans Gordon (*Tower Hamlets, Stepney*) 955

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

Aliens Bill.—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment [17th July] proposed on Consideration of the Bill, as amended.

Which Amendment was—

"In page 2, line 13, after the word 'character,' to insert the words 'or persecution, involving danger of imprisonment or danger to life or limb, on account of religious belief."—(*Mr Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Major Evans Gordon 957
Mr. Forde Ridley 962

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

"In line 2, after the first word 'or,' to insert the word 'imminent.' "—(*Major Evans Gordon.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'imminent' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

July 17.] Page

Lord Hugh Cecil .. 963
Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 964

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.) .. 965

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

" In line 2, after the word ' imprisonment ' to insert the words ' or of confiscation of property.' "—(*Mr. Norman.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

Sir Robert Finlay .. 966

Question put, and negatived.

Sir Charles Dilke .. 966

Another Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

" In line 2, after the word ' to ' to insert the word ' liberty. "—

(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' liberty ' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

Sir Robert Finlay .. 966
Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 966
Mr. Norman .. 967
Mr. Bond (Nottingham, E.) .. 967
Major Seely .. 967
Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.) .. 967
Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 968

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 147 ; Noes, 203. (Division List No. 289.)

Mr. Rufus Isaacs .. 973

Another Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

" At the end, to add the words ' or political opinions.' "—(*Mr. Rufus Isaacs.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there added to the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

Sir Robert Finlay .. 974

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 152 ; Noes, 214. (Division List No. 290.)

Proposed words insert in the Bill.

Mr. Austin Taylor 977

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 19, to leave out from the word, 'country,' to the word 'he,' in line 21."—(*Mr. Austin Taylor.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir Robert Finlay 979
Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) 980

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 220 ; Noes, 162. (Division List No. 291.)

Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby) 983
Major Seely 985

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out from the word 'subject,' to the end of Sub-section (3)."—(*Mr. Leif Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.) 986
Sir Robert Finlay 986
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 986
Mr. Butcher (York) 987

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Dalziel 987

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 1, to leave out Clause 2."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Akers-Douglas 988
Mr. Guest (Plymouth) 988
Mr. Peel (Manchester, S.) 989
Mr. Churchill (Oldham) 990
Mr. Akers-Douglas 991

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

July 17.] Page

Naval Prize Bill [Lords].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 992

Crown Lands Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 992

Local Authorities (Transfer of Treasury Powers) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 992

Accidents (Mines and Factories) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 992

Trade Marks (Recommitted) Bill.—Considered in Committee; Committee report Progress; to sit again this day 992

Public Libraries Acts (Extension) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 992

Canals (No. 2) Bill.—Order for second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 992

Land Judge's Court (Ireland).—Return ordered, "by counties, of the Estates in the Land Judge's Court over which Receivers have been appointed in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 182, of Session 1904."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell*) 993

Adjournment.—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 993
Mr. Churchill (*Oldham*) 994
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (*Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington*) 996

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 18th JULY, 1905.

Introduced.—The right hon. William Court Gully, late Speaker of the House of Commons, having been created Viscount Selby of the city of Carlisle, was (in the usual manner) introduced 997

Sat First.—The Lord Balinhard (*E. Southesk*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 997

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London County Council (Tramways) Bill.—Moved, "That the Order made on the 16th day of March last, 'That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª." (*The Chairman of Committees.*)

Viscount Ridley 997

Amendment moved—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and add at the end of the Motion the words 'this day three months.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

Lord Chelmsford 1002
The Earl of Mayo 1005
The Duke of Rutland 1006
Earl Carrington 1007
The Chairman of Committees (*The Earl of Onslow*) 1009
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 1012
Lord Tweedmouth 1014
Lord James of Hereford 1016

On Question, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Motion," their Lordships divided:—Contents, 33; Not-Contents, 64.

Moved "That the words 'this day three months' be there added"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Bill to be read 2^a this day three months.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill.—Reported without Amendment 1017

North British Railway (General Powers) Bill.—Reported specially with Amendments 1017

Caledonian Railway Bill; Liverpool Corporation Bill; South Barracas (Buenos Ayres) Gas and Coke Company Bill [H.L.]. Reported with Amendments 1017

Midland Railway Bill.—Read 3^a with the Amendments and passed and returned to the Commons 1017

Thames Conservancy Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners 1017

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Moved "That the order made on the 16th day of March last, 'That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next' be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House 1018

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Aendments to be received on Thursday next 1018

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 16) Bill.; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 17) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a on Thursday next 1018

PETITIONS.

PATENTS DESIGNS AND TRADE MARKS (REGISTRATION OF PATENT AGENTS) BILL [H.L.].—Petition that the Bill may be referred to a Select Committee; of Patent Agents signing; read and ordered to lie on the Table 1019

LICENSED HOUSES.—Petition for the early closing of; of Reading and District Temperance Council; Stockport Lodge No. 300 of the Independent Order of Good Templars. Read: and ordered to lie on the Table 1019

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3440. France (Cherbourg).

No. 3441. Russia (Moscow) 1019

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.—No. 634. Belgium (The Diamond Industry of Antwerp) 1019

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.—Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June. 1905.

Presented (by Command) and ordered to lie on the Table 1019

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).—Fourteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under Section 29 of the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1019

DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND) BILL.—Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of the Amendment made in Committee of the Whole House to be receievd on Thursday next 1019

SHIPOWNERS' NEGLIGENCE (REMEDIES) BILL.—Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of the Amendment made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Thursday next 1019

COAL MINES (WEIGHING OF MINERALS) BILL.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

MACEDONIA.

Lord Newton 1020
The Earl of Crewe 1026
The Lord Bishop of Oxford 1028
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 1030
Lord Newton 1038

RETIREMENT OF CAVALRY OFFICERS.

Lord Heneage 1039
The Under Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) .. 1039

ACCIDENTS TO SEAMEN

Lord Muskerry 1040
The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Duke of Marlborough* 1040

House adjourned at ten minutes before Seven o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 18TH JULY, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable. viz. :—Earl of Stamford's Cheshire Estate Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1041

Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1041

Formby Township Bill [LORDS]; Workington Harbour and Dock Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1041

Thames Conservancy Bill.—Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed [New Title.] 1041

Humber Conservancy Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1041

Wigan Corporation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1041

Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) (No. 2) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 1041

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 1041

July 18.] *Page*

Blackpool Improvement Bill [Lords]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1041

Bristol Blind Asylum Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table 1042

Corbett Estate Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the table, and to be printed 1042

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill, without Amendment.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill; Dublin United Tramway Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill; Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill [Lords], without Amendment 1042

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Edinburgh, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1042

Elementary Education (Bible Teaching in State Schools).—Petition from Long Crendon, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1042

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Gross Departmental Expenditure.—Return [presented 17th July] to be printed. [No. 243.] 1042

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887 (Eviction Notices).—Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1042

Wireless Telegraphy.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 29th June; *Captain Norton*]; to lie upon the Table 1042

Joint Stock Companies (Dublin).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th March; *Mr. Nannetti*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 244.] 1043

Companies (Winding-up).—Copy presented, of Fourteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 245.] 1043

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 634 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1043

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3440 and 3441 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1043

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF SIXTY-FIVE).—Copy ordered, " of Treasury Minute, dated the 17th day of July, 1905, stating the circumstances under which certain Civil Servants have been retained in the Service after they have attained the age of Sixty-five; and of the Return therein referred to."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) 1043

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) (RATES).—Return ordered, " showing the number of parishes within the Congested Districts in Scotland where the combined Rates amount to more than five shillings in the pound, the amount of the Rates in each case, and also the increase during the last twenty years."—(*Mr. John Dewar.*) 1043

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

SALE OF OBSOLETE WARSHIPS AT PORTSMOUTH—NAMES AND PRICES REALISED.—Question, Mr. J. H. Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Pretyman .. 1043

POST OFFICE STAFF.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, Lord Stanley 1044

SHEEP SCAB IN SHROPSHIRE.—Question, Mr. Bright (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 1044

BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS.—Question, Mr. Morrel (Oxfordshire, Woodstock); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1045

DIPHTHERIA OUTBREAK AT NORWOOD POOR LAW SCHOOLS.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1046

LAW OF TREASURE TROVE IN WALES.—Question, Mr. George Kenyon (Denbigh Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1046

PROMOTION OF ASSISTANT CLERKS IN THE STATISTICAL OFFICE, CUSTOM HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Joseph Howard (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1047

BRITISH CONSULATE AT ALGIERS.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Earl Percy 1047

EXPORT BOUNTIES ON STEEL, IRON, AND COAL FROM RHENISH WESTPHALIAN MINES.—Question, Sir Thomas Wrightson (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Bonar Law 1048

MONTHLY CIRCULATION ON RETURN OF PASSENGERS FOR PLACES OUT OF EUROPE.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Mr. Bonar Law 1048

REVENUE DERIVED IN THE UNITED KINGDOM FROM TAXATION OF FOOD AND DRINK.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1049

ACQUISITION OF LAND BY THE INDIAN GOVERNMENT.—Question, Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1051

July 18.] *Page*

Education of Children of Agricultural Labourers in Assam.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1052

Military Camp on Evicted Farm at Clonaslee.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1052

Manufacture of the New Short Rifle.—Question, Sir Henry Seton-Karr (St. Helens); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1053

Redistribution—Appointment and Terms of Reference of Boundary Commission.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1053

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Sale of Obsolete Warships at Portsmouth—Names and Prices Realised.—Question, Mr. J. H. Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 1053

The Admiralty and the Welsh Coalfields.—Question, Sir Lees Knowles (Salford, W.); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1054

The War Stores Inquiry.—Question, Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1055

Army Bayonet Contracts.—Question, Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 1056

War Office Land Purchase in the Kyles of Bute.—Question, Mr. Dobbie (Ayr Burghs); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1056

Army Vaccine Institute.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1057

Mr. Van Remsburg.—Questions, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs), and Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Lyttelton (Warwick and Leamington) 1057

Punishment of Chinese on the Rand Mines.—Question, Mr. Burt (Morpeth); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1059

Precautions Against Riot of the Rand Mines.—Question, Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1060

The Flogging of Chinese Coolies on the Rand Mines.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.), and Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1060

Disposal of Police Courts Fines.—Question, Mr. Scott Montagu; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustines) 1061

July 18.] *Page*

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL AND THE POSTAL STAFF.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.), Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.), Mr. Nannetti, and Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1062

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK WITHDRAWALS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Stanley 1064

WEST INDIAN MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Lamont (Buteshire); Answer, Lord Stanley 1065

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNTY OF LONDON AND DISTRICT ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Lough; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Bonar Law, Glasgow, Blackfriars) 1065

THE HARCOURT MEMORIAL.—Question, Sir W. Hart Dyke (Kent, Dartford); Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 1066

BIG BEN.—Questions, Colonel Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square), Mr. J. F. Hope, Mr. Disraeli (Cheshire, Altrincham), and Mr. Lough 1066

LISCARD INSTITUTION, LIVERPOOL.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 1067

ABERDEEN EDUCATIONAL TRUST HOME FOR TRAINING GIRLS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 1068

MOTOR FISHING BOATS FOR IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland, Mr. Walter Long (Bristol, S.) .. 1068

DUNDONALD CEMETERY.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.), and Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1068

CLONASLEE EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1070

WICKLOW EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1070

LORD LANSDOWNE'S EVICTED TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Delany and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1070

ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAND PURCHASE ACT.—Questions, Mr. Lough, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid), Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1071

BLACKDITCHES (WICKLOW) EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1072

CRAGG AND ARDCRONE FARMS, KERRY.—Questions, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.), and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1072

IRISH POOR LAW COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1073

July 18.] *Page*

BOYLE DISTURBANCES.—Questions, Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Delany; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1073

KERRY ASSIZES.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1074

LAND PURCHASE AGREEMENTS.—Questions, Mr. Murphy; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1074

DUBLIN PROBATE COURT—THE CLERK OF THE SEAT.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor; Answers, The Financial Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1075

SIGNATURES IN IRISH ON POSTAL ORDERS.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1076

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL.—Questions, Mr. Lough; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1076

REDISTRIBUTION—GOVERNMENT METHOD OF PROCEDURE.—Questions, Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (Wiltshire, Chippenham), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean), and Mr. Lambert, (Devonshire, South Molton), Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1077

IRISH REPRESENTATION IN THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1080

REDISTRIBUTION ANOMALIES.—Questions, Mr. Mooney (Dublin County, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1081

KINCARDINESHIRE AND REDISTRIBUTION.—Question, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1082

SOUTH DOWN AND RESTRIBUTION.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1083

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); and Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1083

NAVAL WORKS [CONSOLIDATED FUND].

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of making further provision for the construction of works in the United Kingdom and elsewhere for the purposes of the Royal Navy, and of authorising the payment, out of the Consolidated Fund, of such sums as may be necessary for those purposes (King's Recommendation signified)."—(*Mr. Pretyman.*)

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 222; Noes, 143. (Division List No. 292.) .. 1089

July 18.] Page

Churches (Scotland) Bill.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 1089

Motion made, and Question proposed, ".That it be an instruction to the Committee that they have power to divide the Bill into two parts, separating the provision relating to the Established Church of Scotland from those relating to the Free and the United Free Church."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

The Lord Advocate (*Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton*) 1090
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 1091
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 1092
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1094
Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire Mid.*) 1095
Sir Mark Stewart (*Kirkcudbrightshire*) 1096
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 1096
Mr. Guest (*Plymouth*) 1097
Mr. Austin Taylor (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 1097
Mr. J. A. Campbell (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) 1098

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 103 ; Noes, 203. (Division List No. 293.)

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Mr. Buchanan (*Perthshire, E.*) 1101

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, to leave out Sub-section (2)."—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1104
Mr. Wallace (*Perth*) 1106
Mr. Ainsworth (*Argyllshire*) 1106
Mr. Thomas Shaw (*Hawick Burghs*) 1107

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Scott Dickson 1108

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, after the word 'Commission,' to insert the words 'in making their allocation of property under this Act.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Scott Dickson 1109

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 26, to leave out from the word 'that,' to the word 'with,' in page 2, line 4, and insert the words 'out of those who in the opinion of the Commission were members or adherents of the congregation on the thirtieth day of October, nineteen hundred, and are at the commencement of this Act both resident in the district, and members or adherents of the Free Church or United Free Church congregation, at least one-third are members or adherents of the Free Church congregation.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Thomas Shaw (*Hawick Burghs*) 1110

Question put and negatived, words inserted.

Mr. Parker Smith (*Lanarkshire, Partick*) 1110

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 5, after the word 'however,' to insert the words 'to give money compensation in any such case or.'"—(*Mr. Parker Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Scott Dickson 1111
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1111

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 7, after the word 'treatment,' to insert the words 'all congregational property not allocated to the Free Church shall be allocated to the United Free Church."—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Scott Dickson 1113

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Cameron Corbett (*Glasgow, Tradeston*) 1113

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 8, leave out Sub-section (3) and insert the words (3) 'The Commission, with due regard to the carrying out of the purposes for which the funds and property were respectively given, shall make such provision as they shall consider in all the circumstances to be reasonable for supplementing congregational contributions and other income of the Free Church for—(*a*) the theological education of the students for the ministry of that Church; (*b*) the support of aged and infirm ministers and of widows and orphans of ministers of that Church; (*c*) the support of the ministers of Free Church congregations to which the congregational property has been allocated under this Act; (*d*) provision for itinerant preachers; and (*e*) the general administrative purposes of that Church.' "—(*Mr. Corbett.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Black 1114
Mr. Bryce 1114
Sir Robert Reid (*Dumfries Burghs*) 1115
Mr. Scott Dickson 1116
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1118

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. Bryce 1119

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 8, to leave out the word 'adequate.' "—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'adequate' stand part of the clause."

Colonel Denny (*Kilmarnock Burghs*) 1119
Sir Robert Reid 1120

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 9, after the word 'students,' to insert the words 'for the ministry.' "—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 12, to leave out the words 'that Church,' and insert the words 'Free Church congregations to which congregational property has been allocated under this Act.' "—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

July 18.] Page

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Black 1120

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 13, to leave out the words 'for the general purposes,' and insert the words 'for the due management and conduct of the business and financial affairs.' "—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Scott Dickson 1121
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1121
Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) 1122

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 13, after the word 'purposes' to insert the words 'of administration and management.' "—(*Sir Robert Reid.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 13, to leave out from the word 'Church' to the end of the Sub-section, and insert the words " including expenses of administration and provision for itinerant preachers. The funds and property out of which provision may be made for each of the above-mentioned objects shall be those set out in the second column of the first schedule to this Act, opposite the description of the object in the first column of that schedule.' "—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Mr. Scott Dickson 1122

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, lines 16 and 17, to leave out the words 'including interim orders having temporary effect.' "—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 20, after the word 'Fund' to insert the words 'and may also, before that allocation is made, make interim orders having temporary effect as respects the property in question as defined by this Act.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 21, at end, to insert the words 'and may be recorded in the usual manner in the Register of Sasines and other appropriate register, and such registration shall have the effect of vesting the property in the persons specified in the order.'"—(*Colonel Denny.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Scott-Dickson 1123
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1123
Mr. Caldwell 1123

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 22, at the beginning, to insert the words 'Subject to the provisions of this Act.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 25, after the word 'Church' to insert the words 'or in favour of third parties who may advance money for the purposes of such bond or charge.'"—(*Mr. Black.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Black 1124

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 25, at the end, to add the words 'and may provide for the disposal of any property in the event of any congregation interested in such property falling below a certain specified number of members and adherents.'"—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. Scott-Dickson 1125
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1125
Sir Robert Reid 1125
Mr. Caldwell 1126

Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 1126
Mr. Wallace 1126
Mr. Bryce 1126

Question put and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 2, line 25, at the end, to insert the words, 'Any congregational property allocated to either Church shall be subject to any bonds or burdens thereon, or in respect thereof, and the Commissioners may charge upon the particular congregational property concerned any money expended since 31st October, 1900, on improvements of property or in paying off debt incurred in respect of property.'"—(*Colonel Denny.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Parker Smith 1127

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 2, line 28, at the end, to insert the words 'as at the date of allocation.'"—(*Mr. Parker Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Thomas Shaw 1127

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 3, after the word 'rights' to insert the words 'duties and liabilities.'"—(*Mr. Corbett.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4:—

Mr. Parker Smith 1128

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 38, after the word 'Church' to insert the words 'or any congregation thereof.'"—(*Mr. Parker Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Scott Dickson 1129

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 14, at the end, to insert the words, '(3) Any legacies under testamentary writings made before the thirtieth day of October, 1900, by testators who died thereafter and before the commencement of this Act in dispute between the Free Church and the United Free Church shall be allocated to or apportioned between the Churches in such manner as the Commission deem fair and equitable, having regard to what seems to them to have been the intention of the testator, and the capacity of the Churches respectively to carry out any special trusts annexed to the legacy; and all proceedings in any Court as regards any disputes between the two Churches in respect of such legacies shall be sisted or stayed.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Haldane 1129
Mr. Scott Dickson 1130
Mr. Caldwell 1130
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1130

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

> "In line 1, after the word 'legacies' to insert the words 'or dispositions of property.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Scott Dickson 1131

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Caldwell 1131

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

> "In line 9, at the end, to add the words 'and with regard to any legacies or dispositions of property under testamentary or other writings made before the thirtieth day of October, nineteen hundred, by testators who may die after the commencement of this Act, the Commission shall make provision for allocating the same to either or to both of the said Churches as the Commissioners may think proper.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added to the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Scott Dickson 1132

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

July 18.] Page

Clause 5 :-

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That consideration of the clause be postponed."—(*Mr. Wallace.*)

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 6 :—

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 5, line 1, to leave out the word ' Schedule,' and insert the words,

Schedules.

First Schedule.

Object.	Funds and Property.
1. Education of students of the Free Church.	1. College endowments and bursary Funds ; college buildings.
2. Support of aged and infirm ministers of the Free Church.	2. Aged and Infirm Ministers Fund.
3. Support of widows and orphans of ministers of the Free Church.	3. Widows and Orphans Fund.
4. (a) Supplementing congregational contributions towards the support of ministers of Free Church congregations to which congregational property has been allocated under this Act. (b) General purposes of the Church, including expenses of administration and provision for itinerant preachers.	4. Sustentation Fund ; Home Missions Fund ; Highlands and Islands Fund ; any moneys which the Commission regard as applicable for general Church purposes. So far as those Funds or moneys are not sufficient, any further amount required for this object shall be provided by such bond or charge as the Commission may direct to be imposed on any land or buildings in Scotland allocated to the United Free Church other than congregational property, training colleges for teachers, schools, and any land or buildings bequeathed for special purposes.

Second Schedule."

—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Mr. Scott Dickson 1133
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1135
Mr. Black 1136
Mr. Bryce 1136
Mr. Scott Dickson 1136
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1137

Schedule agreed to.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again to-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

Aliens Bill.—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment proposed [17th July] on Consideration of the Bill, as amended.

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out Clause 2."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 1138
Mr. Renwick (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*) 1139
Mr. Purvis (*Peterborough*) 1140
Mr. Forde Ridley (*Bethnal Green, S.W.*) 1141

Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 173 ; Noes, 132. (Division List No. 294.)

Mr. Cremer (*Shoreditch, Haggerston*) 1145
Mr. John Wilson (*Durham, Mid*) 1146

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 20, at the end, to insert the words (3) 'Notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained one member of the immigration board shall be a member of some *bona fide* organization of workmen."—*Mr. Cremer.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Major Evans Gordon (*Tower Hamlets, Stepney*) 1147
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's*) 1147
Mr. Fenwick (*Northumberland, Wansbeck*) 1148
Mr. Spear (*Devonshire, Tavistock*) 1149
Mr. Crooks (*Woolwich*) 1150
Mr. Renwick (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*) 1150
Mr. James Joicey (*Durham, Chester-le-Street*) 1151
Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 1152
Mr. Harwood (*Bolton*) 1152
Mr. Churchill (*Oldham*) 1152

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 168 ; Noes, 217. (Division List N. 295.)

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

“ In page 3, line 30, after the word ‘ fine,’ to insert the words ‘ or of an offence under paragraph twenty-two or twenty-three of section three hundred and eighty-one of The Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892, or of an offence as a prostitute under Section seventy-two of The Towns Improvement (Ireland) Act, 1854, or paragraph eleven of Section fifty-four of the Metropolitan Police Act, 1839.’ ”—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Leif Jones (*Westmoreland, Appleby*) 1156

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

“ In page 4, line 20, to leave out Sub-section (2) of Clause 4.”—(*Mr. Leif Jones.*)

Question proposed, “ That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill.”

The Attorney-General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 1158

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 244 ; Noes, 177. (Division List No. 296.)

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, Mr. Speaker proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of July 5th, to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

“ In page 7, line 29, after the word ‘ Act,’ to insert the words ‘ on an appeal to an immigration board.’ ”—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, “ That the Amendment be made,” put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

In page 7, line 33, after the word ‘ character,’ to insert the words ‘ or whether a crime is an extradition crime.’ ”—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, “ That the Amendment be made,” put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

“ In page 7, line 34, to leave out the words from the first ‘ State,’ to the end of line 35, and insert the words ‘ in accordance with rules made under this Act, and the Board shall act in accordance with his decision.’ ”—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question “ That the Amendment be made,” put, and agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 277.]

[July 18.] *Page*

EAST INDIA LOANS [RAILWAYS].

Resolution reported—

> "That it is expedient to authorise the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise in the United Kingdom on the security of the Revenues of India, by the creation and issue of capital stock, bonds, debentures, or bills, a sum not exceeding £20,000,000 for the following purposes :—
>
> (*a*) The construction, extension, and equipment of Railways in India by State Agency or through the Agency of Companies.
>
> (*b*) The repayment of the principal of any bonds or debentures issued by any such company under the guarantee of the Secretary of State.
>
> (*c*) The discharge of any obligations incurred by the Secretary of State by reason of the purchase of any railway or the determination of any contract from or with such company."

Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid.*) 1162
The Secretary of State for India (*Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford*) .. 1163

Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means and Mr. Secretary Brodrick.

East India Loans (Railways) Bill.—"To empower the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise money in the United Kingdom for the construction, extension, and equipment of Railways in India by State agency or through the agency of companies; and for other purposes," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 278.]

Lunacy Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1164

Prize Courts Bill [LORDS].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1164

Medical Act (1886) Amendment Bill.—[THIRD READING.]—Order for Third Reading Read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

General Laurie (*Pembroke and Haverfordwest*) 1165
Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid.*) 1165

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Sir Frederick Banbury (Camberwell, Peckham) 1166
Mr. Herbert Robertson (Hackney, S.) 1167

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Subject to the provisions of this Act a tenant' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.) 1168
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) 1168

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Trade Marks (Recommitted) Bill.—Considered in Committee, and reported; as amended; to be considered to-morrow 1168

Adjourned at seven minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 19TH JULY, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Littlehampton Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—As amended, to be considered To-morrow 1169

Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Acton District) Bill [LORDS].—South Lancashire Tramways Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1169

Central London Railway Bill (BY ORDER).—Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 2) Bill (by Order). Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next 1169

North East London Railway Bill.—Ordered, That Standing Orders 84, 214, 215, and 239 be suspended, and that the Bill be now taken into consideration.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill, as amended, considered accordingly. Bill to be read the third time 1169

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1169

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) (No. 2) Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow 1169

July 19.] Page

County of London Electric Supply Company Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1169

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).—Sir ALEXANDER HARGREAVES BROWN reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned until Friday, at half-past Eleven o'clock. Report to lie upon the Table 1169

Sandgate Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1170

London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill.

Moved, That, in the case of the London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill, Standing Orders 84, 214, and 239 be suspended, and that the Bill be now taken into consideration (provided amended prints shall have been previously deposited).—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Objection being taken the Motion stood over 1170

PETITIONS.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN BILL.—Petition from Newport, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1170

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.—Petition from Birmingham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1170

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.—Return [presented 18th July]; to be printed. [No. 246] 1170

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 18th July, 1905, upon the recommendations of the University Colleges Committee [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1170

NAVAL WORKS.—Copy presented, of Memorandum showing the Works upon which Expenditure is proposed to be provided for under the Naval Works Bill of the present Session [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1171

AFRICA (No. 5, 1905).—Copy presented, of Award of His Majesty the King of Italy respecting the Western Boundary of the Barotse Kingdom. With a Map [by Command]: to lie upon the Table 1171

JAPAN (No. 1, 1905).—Copy presented of Award of the Arbitration Tribunal appointed to pronounce on certain questions as to the Interpretation of Treaties with Japan with regard to Leases held in Perpetuity [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1171

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3442 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1171

July 19.] Page

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Union of Benefices Act (Saint Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor and Saint Benet Fink). Copy of Scheme under The Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting a Union of the Benefices of Saint Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor and Saint Benet Fink [by Act] 1171

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

COMPENSATION TO ALBERT BLAKE FOR WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1171

CHINESE COOLIES IN BRITISH NORTH BORNEO.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Earl Percy 1172

MÜRZSTEG PROGRAMME—EXEMPTION FROM ONE YEAR'S TAXATION OF CHRISTIAN VILLAGES BURNT IN 1903.—Question, Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud); Answer, Earl Percy 1172

SHEEP STOLEN FROM MICHAEL O'CONNOR AT GORTFADA.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1173

OFFICIALS OF IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1173

ALLOCATION OF SPIRIT LICENCE DUTIES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1173

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—SALARIES OF PRESS CENSORS.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Shetland and Orkney); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 1173

THE PROPOSED REDUCTION OF THE VOLUNTEER FORCE—TEST OF EFFICIENCY.—Questions, Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1174

WAR OFFICE—FINANCE BRANCH.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1175

INDIAN ARMY ADMINISTRATION—THE VICEROY'S SPEECH.—Questions, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1175

SPIRIT FOR MANUFACTURING PURPOSES—REGULATIONS.—Questions, Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross) and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcester, E.) 1176

CUSTOMS WATCHERS.—Questions, Mr. Causton (Southwark, W.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1177

BRITISH FRUIT INDUSTRY.—Questions, Mr. Higham (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby); Answer, The President of the Local GovernmentBoard (Mr .Ailwyn Fellowes, Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) 1178

July 19.] *Page*

ANTHRAX IN DEVONSHIRE.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 1178

POLLUTION OF THE THAMES ESTUARY.—Question, Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1179

WORK FOR THE UNEMPLOYED—OBSOLETE ACTS.—Questions, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1179

THE HOLBORN BOROUGH COUNCIL DISCLOSURES—CASE OF MR. L. H. ISAACS.—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1180

THE CORNEWALL STATUE.—Questions, Sir Elliott Lees (Birkenhead); Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 1181

PROSECUTIONS OF SCOTTISH ANTI-VACCINATIONISTS.—Question, Mr. Weir, (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 1181

SNEEM STEAMER SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 1182

NETTERVILLE ESTATE, GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Reddy (King's County, Birr); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1182

MR. O'HARA TRENCHE'S ESTATE, GALWAY.—Questions, Mr. Reddy; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1182

CRIME IN COUNTY CORK.—Questions, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.), and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1183

IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.—Questions, Mr. Boland; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1184

IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION RULES.—Questions, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1185

IRISH PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) and Mr. T. W. Russell; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1184

USE OF SUBMARINES FOR WAR.—Question, Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1186

TOWN TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1186

LORD ROBERTS AND ARMY EFFICIENCY.—Question, Mr. A. J. Balfour; Answer, Mr. Lambert 1187

THE DISCUSSION OF SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs), Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), Mr. Lough, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Sir Henry Fowler, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.), Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1187

THE VOTE OF CENSURE.—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1191

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. Broadhurst, and Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour.. 1191

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Frederick William Chance, esquire, for the Borough of Carlisle 1192

POLICE AND SANITARY COMMITTEE.—Special Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 247.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 247.] 1192

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) (No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 279.] 1192

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 280.] 1193

NATIONAL MONUMENTS IN CHURCHES.

Sir Elliott Lees (*Birkenhead*) 1193

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to prevent the removal, without Parliamentary sanction, of Monuments which have been erected in Cathedrals or Churches out of Public Moneys in pursuance of a Vote by Parliament."—(*Sir Elliott Lees.*)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1194

Question, "That the debate be now adjourned," put, and agreed to.

NAVAL WORKS [CONSOLIDATED FUND].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to make further provision for the construction of works in the United Kingdom and elsewhere for the purposes of the Royal Navy, and to authorise the issue, out of the Consolidated Fund, of such sums, not exceeding £5,835,000, as may be required for those purposes, and to make provision for raising

in the manner provided by Section 5 of The Naval Works Act, 1895, the sums so issued by Terminable Annuities for a period not exceeding thirty years from the dates of the borrowing."—(*Mr. Arthur Lee.*)

Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 1196
The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Arthur Lee, Hants., Fareham) .. 1197
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 1198
Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 1202
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 1203
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1203
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1205
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 1205
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 1206

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 219 ; Noes 168. (Division List No. 297.)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

Churches (Scotland) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 5 :—

Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 1210

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 20, to leave out from the word 'established,' to the word 'shall,' in line 22.' "—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1218
Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 1223
Mr. Parker Smith (Lanarkshire, Partick) 1225
Mr. Samuel Smith (Flintshire) 1226
Mr. Charles Douglas (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 1227
The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Blackfriars) 1228
Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire) 1230

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 195 ; Noes, 135. (Division List No. 298.)

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid) 1233

July 19.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 24, to leave out the words 'the majority,' and insert the words 'not less than two thirds.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'majority' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Scott Dickson 1236
Mr. Caldwell 1237
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 1237

Question put.

The Comittee divided :—Ayes, 210 ; Noes, 115. (Division List No. 299.)

Mr. Austin Taylor (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 1243

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 24, after the word 'thereof,' to insert the words 'any formula so prescribed shall be laid as soon as may be before both Houses of Parliament, and if either House of Parliament within the next forty days resolves that the formula ought to be annulled, it shall, after the date of that Resolution, be of no effect.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1250
Sir Robert Reid (*Dumfries Burghs*) 1251
Mr. Harwood (*Bolton*) 1252

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 86 ; Noes, 219. (Division List No. 300.)

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again To-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

Aliens Bill. [THIRD READING.].—Order for Third Reading read.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's*) 1257

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Major Seely (*Isle of Wight*) 1262
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 1262

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words upon 'this day three months,'"—(*Major Seely.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) 1264
Mr. Atherley-Jones (Durham, N.W.) 1269
Mr. Stuart Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) 1272
Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central) 1274
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 1276
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1278
Mr. Fenwick (Northumberland, Wansbeck) 1287

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 214 ; Noes, 136. (Division List No. 301.)

Main Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 193 ; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 302.)

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Trade Unions Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged ; Bill withdrawn 1295

Public Meetings (Facilities) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed for Monday next 1295

Telegraph (Construction) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1296

Adjourned at twenty-four minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS : THURSDAY, 20TH JULY, 1905.

VISCOUNT HAWARDEN.—Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of Robert Henry Viscount Hawarden, in the Peerage of Ireland, to vote at the election of Representatives Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1297

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 1297

Rhondda Urban District Council Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1297

July 20.] *Page*

Malvern Water Bill.—The Lord Chancellor informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The order made on the 11th instant discharged, and Bill committed 1297

Bootle Corporation Bill; London Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bills passed, and returned to the Commons .. 1297

Wigan Corporation Bill; North East London Railway Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners 1297

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1297

London County Council (Money) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment .. 1297

Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) (No. 2) Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1^a; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners (No. 149) 1297

Glasgow University Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to the M'Callum Celtic Lectureship in the University of Glasgow. Was presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow; read 1a; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Section 7), deemed to have been read 2^a; and reported from the Committee. (No. 150) 1297

Tramway Orders Confirmation (No. 2 Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3a To-morrow 1298

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 16) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 17) Bill.—Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed 1298

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AFRICA, No. 5 (1905).—Award of His Majesty the King of Italy respecting the Western Boundary of the Barotse Kingdom (with a map) 1298

JAPAN, No. 1 (1905).—Award of the Arbitration Tribunal appointed to pronounce on certain questions as to the interpretation of treaties with Japan with regard to leases held in perpetuity 1298

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES.—Treasury Minute, dated 18th July, 1905, upon the recommendations of the University Colleges Committee 1298

NAVAL WORKS.—Memorandum showing the works upon which expenditure is proposed to be provided for under the Naval Works Bill of the present session. 1298

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3442. Turkey (Erzeroun).

No. 3443. Morocco (Dar-al-Baida) 1298

STATISTICS.—Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1890 to 1904. Fifty-second number 1298

RAILWAY RETURNS.—Returns of the Capital Traffic Receipts and Working Expenditure of the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom, for the year 1904; with a general report thereon, and summary tables for a series of years.
Presented, (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1299

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1906 1299

BANKRUPTCY.—Twenty-second General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under Section 131 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1299

UNION OF BENEFICES (METROPOLIS) ACT, 1860.—Scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for effecting an union of the benefice of Saint Michael, Cornhill, in the City of London, and the benefice of Saint Peter-le-Poor with the vicarage of Saint Benet Fink annexed, and for effecting certain other measures incidental to or arising out of such union. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 146) 1299

Aliens Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next. (No. 147) 1299

Medical Act (1886) Amendment Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 148) 1299

Drunkenness (Ireland) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 1299

Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies) Bill.—Amendment reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 1299

Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill.—[SECOND READING.].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Newton 1300

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Newton.*)

The Earl of Lichfield 1302
Lord Wolverton 1302
Lord Burghclere 1303

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

County Courts (Ireland) Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor of Ireland (*Lord Ashbourne*) 1304

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª"—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION.

The Lord Bishop of Ripon 1304
The Duke of Devonshire 1312
The Earl of Meath 1319
Lord Shuttleworth 1326
The Lord President of the Council and President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (*The Marquess of Londonderry*) .. 1333
Lord Kenyon 1341
The Earl of Crewe 1347
The Secretary for State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 1350
The Duke of Devonshire 1352

QUIT AND CROWN RENTS (IRELAND).

Lord Castletown 1353

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing all sums received for the redemption and purchase of quit and Crown rents in Ireland since 1897."—(*Lord Castletown.*)

The First Commissioner of Works (*Lord Windsor*) 1354

On Question, Motion agreed to; and ordered accordingly.

THE FLOGGING OF CHINAMEN.

Lord Coleridge 1357
The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Duke of Marlborough*) 1359
Earl Spencer 1361

House adjourned at Eight o'clock till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 20TH JULY. 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time and passed with Amendments 1362

Bangor (County Down) Water and Improvement Bill [LORDS].—As amended, to be considered To-morrow 1362

Llandrindod Wells Urban District Council Bill[LORDS].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1362

Matlock Bath Imrrovement Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1362

Littlehampton Urban District Council Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER),—Consideration, as amended, deferred till Monday next 1362

July 20.] *Page*

Wigan Corporation Bill.—Ordered, That, in the case of the Wigan Corporation Bill, Standing Orders 84, 214, 215, and 239 be suspended, and that the Bill be now taken into consideration.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill, as amended, accordingly considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 1362

North-East London Railway Bill.—Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

(King's Consent signified). Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 1363

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment 1363

Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) No. (2) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1363

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [LORDS] (by Order). Consideration, as amended, deferred till Tuesday next 1363

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Midland Railway Bill, with Amendments 1363

PETITION.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN BILL.—Petition from Hackney, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1363

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 249.] 1363

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (UNITED KINGDOM).—Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1890 to 1904, Fifty-second Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1363

RAILWAY RETURNS.—Copy presented, of Returns of the Capital, Traffic Receipts, and Working Expenditure of the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1364

BANKRUPTCY.—Copy presented, of Twenty-second General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 250] 1364

Civil Services and Revenue Departments (Excesses), 1903–4.—Copy presented, of a Statement of the Sum required to be voted in order to make good an Excess on the Grant for Diplomatic and Consular Buildings for the year ended on March 31st, 1904 [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 251] 1364

Civil Servants (Retirement at the Age of Sixty-Five).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered July 18th; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 252] 1364

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3443 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1364

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.—Caledonian Canal. Copy of One-hundredth Report of the Commissioners [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 253] 1364

Government Departments (Contracts).—Return ordered, "of all contracts made in the United Kingdom for manufactured articles by the several Government Departments in the year ending March 31st, 1905, either with contractors outside the United Kingdom or with contractors or agents who obtain the articles from Abroad (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 318, Session 1904)."—(*Sir Howard Vincent*) 1364

Trustee Savings Banks.—Return ordered, "(1) from each Savings Bank in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, containing, in columns, the names of the Officers, their respective salaries, and other allowances, if any; the amount of security each gives, the annual expenses of management, inclusive of all payments and salaries, for the year ended November 20th, 1904; the rate per centum per annum on the capital of the Bank for the expenses of management; the rate of interest paid to Depositors on the various amounts of deposit, and the average rate of interest on all accounts; the number of accounts remaining open; the total amount owing to Depositors; the total amount invested with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt; the balance in the hands of the Treasurer at November 20th, 1904; the total amount of the separate Surplus Fund on November 20th, 1904; other assets, including estimated value of Bank premises, furniture, etc.; the total assets; the total amount of Goverment Stock standing to the credit of Depositors; the number and amount of annuities granted; and the average cost of each transaction; also the year in which business commenced in each Bank, and the name of the day or days, and the number of hours in the week, on which the Banks are open for the deposit and withdrawal of moneys; including in such Return a list of all such Savings Banks as, under the provisions of the Act 26 Vic. c. 14, or otherwise, have been closed and have transferred their funds, or any part thereof, to the Post Office Savings Banks; showing, in each case, the number of such Banks, os well as the number and amount of Depositors' occounts so transferred, and the amount of compensation, if any, made to all or any of the Officers of such Banks respectively; and showing also the years in which such Banks were respectively opened and closed, and the number and amount of their Depositors' balances, and the number of days and hours in each week on which the same Banks were open for public business at the close of the year next preceding the date of such closing; distinguishing the same, as in the Return, for each separate county, as well as collectively, for England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, and for the United Kingdom; and (2) for the year ending November 20th, 1904,

showing the total number of Depositors in Trustee Savings Banks; the total number of deposits; the average amount of each deposit account; the average sums paid in and drawn out; the total number of persons who have deposited in single sums the entire amount allowed to be deposited during the year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 224, of Session 1904)." —(*Mr. Mount*) 1365

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

ISSUE OF SUMMONSES IN DUBLIN LICENSING CASES.—Question, Mr. T. Harrington (Dublin Harbour); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1366

EVICTED TENANTS IN COUNTY KERRY.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1367

DEFENCES AND GARRISONS AT HALIFAX AND ESQUIMAULT.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1367

DESTRUCTION OF PAPERS RELATING TO WAR STORES.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer. Mr. Lyttelton 1367

DEFECTS OF THE NEW SHORT RIFLE.—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1368

TRIALS OF THE SHORT RIFLE.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1368

EFFICIENCY OF VOLUNTEER OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1368

TREATMENT OF CHILDREN AWAITING TRIAL.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 1369

NURSING OF SICK POOR IN WORKHOUSES.—Question, Mr. Talbot (Oxford University); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1369

PAYMENT OF SCHOOL TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Question, Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1370

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE—BRITISH SUBJECTS AFFECTED.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Earl Percy 1370

CHINESE GOVERNMENT AND THE MACKAY TREATY.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Earl Percy 1371

CHINESE COOLIES IN BRITISH NORTH BORNEO.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Earl Percy 1371

MEN INVALIDED FROM MALTA FEVER.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1331

SUBMARINES—NUMBER OF MEN ALLOWED ON BOARD IN ADDITION TO CREW.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1372

ACCIDENT TO SUBMARINES—METHODS OF ESCAPE FOR CREW.—Question, Sir John Leng; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1372

DELAY IN REPAIRING BRIDGE OVER THE SERPENTINE.—Question, Captain Jessel (St. Pancras, S.); Answer, Lord Balcarres 1373

POSTMEN ACTING AS SECRETARIES TO BUILDING SOCIETIES.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1373

EDUCATIONAL REGULATIONS—REMOVAL OF LOG BOOK.—Question, Mr. Ernest Gray; Answer, Sir William Anson 1373

ERECTION OF DERRYCROFF BRIDGE OF MITCHELL ESTATE, COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1374

EDUCATION OF CHILDREN IN CEYLON.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1374

ARMY STAFF APPOINTMENTS—EXTENSION OF TIME TO ASSISTANT ADJUTANT-GENERAL.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1374

GAMBLING OPERATIONS IN COTTON.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1374

MINISTER OF COMMERCE.—Question, Mr. Hoult (Cheshire, Wirrall); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1376

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

DEAL BARRACKS THEATRE.—Questions, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge 1376

CANADA AND CONTINENTAL EMMIRGANTS.—Questions, Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby) and Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1377

MACEDONIA FINANCIAL REFORMS.—Questions, Mr. Lyell (Dorsetshire, E.) Captain Ellice (St. Andrew's Burghs); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1378

THE WATTSTOWN COLLIERY DISASTER.—Questions, Mr. T. Richards (Monmouthshire), Mr. John Wilson (Durham, Mid.), Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) and Sir Alfred Thomas (Glamorganshire, E.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) and Mr. A. J. Balfour 1378

P.O. AND THE ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.—Questions, Mr. Weir and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1380

STANDARD FARM OF ACCOUNTS FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES.—Questions, Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.); Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1381

REDISTRIBUTION—THE POPULATION LIMIT.—Questions, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1381

July 20.] Page

REDISTRIBUTION STATISTICS.—Questions, Mr. Toulmin (Bury, Lancashire), and Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1382

SALE OF THE WHITFORD ESTATE COALFIELD.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central), Colonel Lucas (Suffolk, Lowestoft), Sir Lees Knowles (Salford, W.), Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) and Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Bonar Law, Glasgow, Blackfriars), and Mr. Pretyman 1382

EXPRESS TRAINS FROM THE NORTH—DANGEROUS FOOTBOARDS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Bonar Law 1385

THE LOSS OF THE "KYBER."—Question, Mr. Spear (Devonshire, Tavistock); Answer, Mr. Bonar Law 1385

THE CHANNEL TUNNEL.—Question, Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade); Answer, Mr. Bonar Law 1386

BIG BEN.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 1386

BEAUFORT CASTLE SHOOTING CASE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 1386

LIMERICK MONEY LENDING CASE.—Questions, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), Mr. Joyce (Limerick) and Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 1386

ROSCOMMON ASSIZES—CASE OF WILLIAM REID.—Questions, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answers, Mr. Atkinson 1387

CORK ASSIZES—CASE OF JEREMIAH COLBERT.—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, Mr. Atkinson 1388

COLONEL WARDER OF SNEEM.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 1388

MAJOR FRENCH'S ROSCOMMON ESTATE.—Question, Mr. James O'Kelly (Roscommon, N.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1389

DUNDONALD CEMETERY, BELFAST.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1389

CONSTABLE FINNIGAN'S TRANSFER FROM COALISLAND TO LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. Doogan (Tyrone, E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1390

COALISLAND—ASSAULT OF JOHN MCMANNUS.—Question, Mr. Doogan; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1390

COALISLAND—ATTACK OF HARKIN'S HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Doogan and Mr. Flynn; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1391

TRINITY COLLEGE LANDS.—Questions, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.), Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.) and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Mr. Walter Long .. 1391

July 20.] *Page*

TRALEE EVICTED TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1392

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—INSTRUCTIONS AS TO THE USE OF TRUNCHEONS.—Question, Mr. Muldoon (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long .. 1392

CARROLL *v.* MASTERTON AND ANOTHER.—Question, Mr. Muldoon, and Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1393

CAPTAIN SANDE'S ESTATE, QUEEN'S COUNTY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1394

H. J. MCFARLANE'S ESTATE.—Questions, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.), Mr. Delany, and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1394

IRISH MIXED SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1395

TOBACCO-GROWING IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1396

IRISH TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Questions, Mr. Sloan; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1397

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. John O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1398

ESTATES COMMISSIONERS AND THE EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1398

PROVISION FOR AFFLICTED CHILDREN IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1399

ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIESTS AND THE INCOME-TAX.—Questions, Mr. Sloan, and Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1399

ABBEYLEIX GUN LICENCE CASE.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, The Financial Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) .. 1400

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS—BUILDING PLANS.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1400

BUNCRANA AND THE TELEPHONE SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Muldoon; Answer, Lord Stanley 1400

FERMOY AND THE TELEPHONE SERVICE.—Question, Mr. William Abraham; Answer, Lord Stanley 1401

IRISH TRADE STATISTICS.—Questions, Mr. Boland, Mr. Lough, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Charles Devlin, Mr. Flavin, and Mr. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Bonar Law 1402

MINISTER OF COMMERCE.—Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1402

RE-DISTRIBUTION—THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE OF COMMISSION.—Question, Sir Henry Kimber (Wandsworth), Mr. Peel, (Manchester, S.), Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.); Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean), Mr. Dalziel, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1403

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Questions, Mr. Weir, and Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1406

SCOTTISH EDUCATION BILL.—Question, Sir John Tuke (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1407

QUESTIONS.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Speaker 1407

BOSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, aud Mr. Kier Hardie; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1408

PROTECTION OF LIFE FROM FIRE.

Report from the Select Committee [Inquiry not completed] brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 254.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 254.] 1408

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Third Report brought up, and read, with part of the Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 248.] 1408

SUPPLY [5TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1905–6. CLASS III.—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £83,415, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.*) 1409
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 1416
Mr. Muldoon (*Denegal, N.*) 1425

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £83,315, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. John Redmond*).

Colonel Saunderson (*Armagh, N.*) 1429
Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 1432
Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) 1440
Mr. Flynn (*Cork, N.*) 1442
Mr. Murphy (*Kerry, E.*) 1445
Mr. Herbert Robertson (*Hackney, S.*) 1447
Mr. J. P. Farrell (*Longford, N.*) 1448
Mr. Boland (*Kerry, S.*) 1450
Mr. Coghill (*Stoke-upon-Trent*) 1454
Sir Ernest Flower (*Bradford, W.*) 1455
Mr. Lundon (*Limerick, E.*) 1456

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Sheffield University Bill [Lords] (by Order).—As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time 1459

Supply [15th Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Civil Services and Revenue Departments Estimates, 1905–6. Class III.—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £83,415, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

Mr. Lundon 1460

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £83,315, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Lundon.*)

Mr. Kilbride (*Kildare, S.*) 1463
The Attorney General for Ireland (*Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.*) .. 1467
Mr. Clancy (*Dublin County, N.*) 1474
Mr. Walter Long 1479
Mr. J. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*) 1483

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 199; Noes, 196. (Division List, No. 303.)

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again to-morrow.

Sale of Butter Bill.—Order for the Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1489

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

THE DEFEAT OF THE GOVERNMENT.

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1489
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 1490
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1491
Mr. John Redmond 1493
Mr. McKenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 1494
Mr. Asquith Fifeshire, E.) 1495
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1495
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 1496

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, FRIDAY, 21ST JULY, 1905.

VISCOUNT HAWARDEN.—Ordered, That the Report of the Lord Chancellor of the United Kingdom, made to the House of Lords on Thursday last, that the right of the Viscount Hawarden to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to his satisfaction, be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, together with a certificate stating that such Report has been made, and that the House has ordered it to be sent to the said Clerk of the Crown in Ireland. 1497

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Thames Conservancy.

And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14); Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1497

July 21.]

Page

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill.—A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee 1497

North Eastern Railway Bill; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill.—The order made on the 4th of July last appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bills, discharged 1497

South Barracas (Buenos Ayres) Gas and Coke Company Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 1497

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill.—Read 3ª, and passed 1497

Great Northern Piccadilly and Brompton Railway (No. 1) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments; further Amendments made. Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 1498

London Government Scheme (Hackney and Edmonton Unions) Bill; London Government Scheme (London and Middlesex) Bill.—Moved, That the Order made on the 16th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bills read 2ª accordingly, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1498

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered (according to Order), and agreed to 1498

Esk Valley Power Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1498

Inverness Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill; Port Glasgow Improvement Provisional Order Bill.—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed 1498

Stonehaven Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Edinburgh Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1498

Paisley District Tramways Order Comfirmation Bill [H.L.].—[SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Marquess of Linlithgow.*)

Lord Harris 1498

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and (pursuant to the provisions of the Private Legislation Procedure Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3ª on Monday next.

Glasgow Corporation (Tramways Consolidation) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to Order), and (pursuant to the provisions of the Private Legislation Procedure Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3ª on Monday next 1499

July 21.] *Page*

Glasgow Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to Order); Amendments made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons .. 1499

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill; North-Eastern Railway Bill; North-Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill; London Government Scheme (London and Middlesex) Bill; London Government Scheme (Hackney and Edmonton Unions) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; viz.:—

D. Manchester,
E. Malmesbury,
E. Eldon.
V. Falmouth;
L. Kintore (*E. Kintore*) (Chairman),

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Monday next, at Twelve o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 1499

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3444. Costa Rica.
No. 3445. Germany.
No. 3446. Italy (Genoa).
No. 3447. Russia (Rustov-on-Don).
No. 3448. Egypt (Port Said and Suez).
No. 3449. China (Wuchow).. 1500

TREATY SERIES (No. 19) (1905).—Convention between the United Kingdom and the Netherlands providing for the settlement by arbitration of certain classes of questions which may arise between the two Governments; signed at London, 15th February, 1905 (ratifications exchanged at London, 12th July 1905) 1500

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.—Further correspondence relating to affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony (in continuation of [Cd. 2401] and [Cd. 2482]) 1500

WEST AFRICA.—Returns of the Revenue and Expenditure (Actual and Estimated) of the West African Colonies and Protectorates, for the years 1885 to 1905–1906.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1500

LONDON CORPORATION.—Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London, for the year 1904. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1500

July 21.] Page

NEW BILLS.

Matrimonial Causes Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1857. Was presented by the Earl Russell ; read 1^a ; to be printed ; and to be read 2^a on Monday the 31st instant. (No. 151) 1500

Wemyss Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Wemyss Tramways. Was presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Sections 6 and 9) ; read 1^a ; and to be printed. (No. 152) 1501

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE'S MOTION.

The Duke of Devonshire 1501
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 1501

LIGHT LOAD LINE COMMITTEE.

Lord Muskerry 1501

Moved to resolve, " That, in the opinion of this House, the Board of Trade should now take the necessary steps in carrying out the recommendation of the Light Load Line Committee that regulations to prevent the shifting of under-deck ballast carried by merchant vessels should be drawn up and enforced."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Duke of Marlborough*) 1507
Earl Spencer 1509
Lord Muskerry 1510

On Question, resolved in the negative.

ALIEN APPRENTICES ON BRITISH SHIPS.

Lord Muskerry 1511
The Duke of Marlborough 1512

Public Roads (Ireland) Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Dunraven 1512

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Earl of Dunraven.*)

The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (*The Marquess of Londonderry*) 1513

On Question, Bill read 2, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

Drunkenness (Ireland) Bill.—Read 3^a (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

THE POSITION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

The Marquess of Ripon 1513
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 1513

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

Earl Spencer 1514
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1515

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at half-past Five o'clock to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 21ST JULY, 1905.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.—Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1517

WEST AFRICA.—Copy presented, of Returns of the Revenue and Expenditure (Actual and Estimated) of the West African Colonies and Protectorates for the years 1885 to 1905–6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1517

Unemployed Workmen Bill.—Copy presented, of the Unemployed Workmen Bill, showing how the Bill would run if the Amendments, of which Mr. Gerald Balfour has given notice, were made in it [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1517

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Chamber of London. Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London for the year 1904 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 255.] 1517

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

SALE OF THE TENANTS INTEREST IN TERMON HOLDING ON THE KING-HARMAN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long .. 1518

THE IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.—Question, Mr. Patrick White (Meath, N.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1519

ASSISTANT CLERKS OF OVER SIX AND UNDER TEN YEARS SERVICE IN PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1519

EXCLUSION OF FOREIGN PRISON-MADE GOODS.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1319

July 21.] Page

Churches (Scotland) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair].

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 1319

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1321

Question put, and negatived.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Postponed Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 1524

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 281].

Adjournment.—Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir A. Acland-Hood*) put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at twenty-eight minutes after Twelve o'clock, till Monday next.

End of Table of Contents to Vol. CXLIX.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION)

IN THE

SIXTH SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, IN THE
FOURTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 10*th July*, 1905.

SAT FIRST.

The Earl of Chichester sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4); Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5); Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6).

Also the Certificates that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills:—Local Government Provisional Order (No. 16); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 17).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill, ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed.

Read, and agreed to.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill; North British Railway (General Powers) Bill. The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bills was withdrawn. The orders made on Monday and Tuesday last discharged, and Bills committed.

Woolwich Borough Council Bill; Great Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill; Andover Lighting and Power Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill [H.L.]. Amendments reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 133.)

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Regulations for the instruction and training of pupil teachers.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, K.G., preserved at Belvoir Castle. Vol. IV.

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).

Report to the Secretary for Scotland of a Departmental Committee on the sea fisheries of Sutherland and Caithness. Volume II. Minutes of evidence and appendices.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS, 1905.

1. (Money Orders) No. 783. The Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment (No. 4) Regulations, 1905; dated 29th June, 1905.

2. (Post Office Savings Banks) No. 785. The Post Office Savings Banks Regulations, 1905; dated 15th May, 1905.

NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.

Account of deposits in Naval Savings Banks and the payments thereof, and of interest thereon, of all investments under the Naval Savings Banks Act, 1866, and the application of the interest or dividends accruing in respect thereof, and of the sale of any stocks, annuities, or securities during the financial year 1903–1904.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) ACTS, 1860 to 1904.

Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the appointment of a visiting committee to the prison at Glasgow (Duke Street).

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILL.

ROYAL DECLARATION BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to modify the declaration required by the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement to be made by the Sovereign. Was presented by the Viscount Llandaff; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 131.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Moved, That Standing Order No. XXXIX. be suspended for this day's sitting.—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne*); agreed to; and ordered accordingly.

DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Friday next. — (*The Earl of Mayo.*) (No. 132.)

HOME DEFENCE.

***The Earl of WEMYSS** rose to move to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House, it would be a danger to the Realm, and limit the power of the Navy as an offensive force in war, to trust to it alone for home defence, and, inasmuch as it is admitted that the Navy cannot guarantee us against so-called hostile 'raids,' it is the more needful that our land defences should at all times be such that no nation would ever attempt in any form a hostile landing on our shores."

The noble Earl said: My Lords, I ask your Lordships' indulgence while I endeavour to give a few reasons in support of the Motion which stands in my name. In *The Times* and the *Morning Post* of May 12th last there appeared reports of a speech by the Prime Minister upon our defences, and in that speech the Prime Minister is stated to have declared that—

> "Serious invasion of these islands is not an eventuality which we need seriously consider."

I had intended to take those words as my text to-night, but I received yesterday from the Prime Minister a corrected copy of his speech. It does not differ very much, but the passage I have quoted, as corrected in the Prime Minister's copy, is as follows—

> "Serious invasion of these islands is not a possibility which we need consider."

That seems to me practically the same thing. Now, my Lords, I propose to show your Lordships, as far as I can, why I think this speech of the Prime Minister's is a dangerous one. I think the danger of it is that it is calculated to put people into a state of confidence with reference to our defences which is not justified by the facts, and that course is certainly not desirable. Moreover, it is, I venture to think, a remarkable speech as coming from a Scotsman, because I have always been told that Scotsmen are known proverbially for their caution. This appears to me to be a very incautious speech, and I venture to traverse the position taken up by the Prime Minister—namely, that serious invasion is a possibility which we need not consider. I venture to think that the history of our past, and opinions which are worth listening to in the present, all point in a contrary direction. Supposing one of your Lordships pricks his finger, what happens? A drop of blood oozes forth. Now, what does that drop of blood spell? It spells invasion, for no civilised country that I know of has been so often successfully invaded.

Let me give a short statement of the invasions which have produced this very mixed blood in English veins. I shall take this not from English history, but from a novel—a foreign novel which appeared towards the close of last year. It is called, "The Coming Conquest of England," and this is what I read in one part—

> "For nine hundred years no hostile army had landed on the shores of England. Certainly in ancient times Britain had had to fight against invading enemies. Julius Cæsar had entered as a conqueror. Canute the Great, King of Denmark, had subdued the country, the Saxons had come over from Germany to make themselves masters of the land; Harold the Fair-headed, King of Norway, had landed in England. But since the time of William of Normandy, who defeated the Saxons at Hastings and set up the rule of the Normans in England, not even her most powerful enemies, neither Philip of Spain nor the great Napoleon, had succeeded in landing their troops on the sea-girt soil of England."

Then comes the question, the writer being a German—

> "Would a German army now succeed?"

I would just remark this in passing. In the extract I have read reference is made to the failure of Philip of Spain and Napoleon. To what was that due? It was due to chance, to the chance of a storm, to the chance of Nelson being out of the way, and to the chance of Sir Robert Calder tackling the French fleet and destroying it, and stopping Napoleon having those six hours which he said was all the time he wanted for landing his 150,000 men and the subduing of England. See what part chance plays in the affairs of the world! I am inclined to think that the Prime Minister and the Defence Committee, of which he made himself the mouthpiece, have not taken into consideration the chances there are in war. As I have said, it is not my intention to give my own opinion but I will quote the opinions of those who are entitled to speak with authority on this subject. The novel I have quoted answers the question of invasion in this way: It supposes that a German army of 60,000 picked men lands somewhere convenient in the Firth of Forth—I am not sure whether it is at Dalmeny or Hopetoun, Lord Linlithgow—and marches straight to London, where they are met by the French army, the Russian army having already taken India from us, and peace is made, after our defeat and capture of London, at Hampton Court. The Prime Minister is the negotiator for England, and the result is that India goes to Russia, Egypt to France, and South Africa to Germany, and nothing is left to us excepting Malta.

I will proceed to quote the opinions of naval and military experts to which even the Prime Minister must bow; they are opinions contrary to his view and to the view of the Defence Committee with regard to the present situation. I take the Report of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission, which Commission did its duty nobly by the nation in spite of the opposition it met with from officialdom in all ways. In that Report there is no end of evidence in the sense to which I have referred, evidence counter to the view of the Prime Minister and of the Defence Committee. I will quote some of the evidence given before that Commission, and will first take that of Sir John Ardagh, who was Director of Military Intelligence from 1896 to 1901. In answer to Question 3243, Sir John Ardagh said—

> "Invasion is highly improbable, but possible. It is unwise to put all our eggs into the naval basket. No pains should be spared to ensure that our Navy is amply sufficient to blockade the enemy's ports and to fight him besides in the open sea."

That I heartily endorse. Sir John Ardagh continues—

> "And behind all that it is indispensable that we should have in the United Kingdom a thoroughly reliable force—

not six battleships, as proposed under the new naval arrangements, but a thoroughly reliable land force—

> "which we can put in the field at a very short notice to oppose 150,000 men. The reasonable hypothesis is that if one method of defence may fail you do not trust to one alone—trust to more than one. A home-defence army is indispensable. If invasion was threatened the Fleet would never be allowed to leave England; there would be a demand for protection from all quarters."

I now come to a naval authority, and will quote the opinion of Sir John Ommaney, who was Controller of the Navy from 1888 to 1892, Commander-in-Chief in the North America and West India Station from 1892 to 1895, and Commander-in-Chief in the Mediterranean from 1896 to 1899. Now, what does Sir John Ommaney say? He says—

> "Looking as the question as a whole, I think it is shortly summed up by saying that, though there is no probability of an invasion, there is a possibility of one which should be guarded against. German papers and magazines think there is no doubt about the practicability of an invasion. That being so, we should be prepared for it."

He decidedly thinks, as did the Duke of Wellington—*vide* his letter—that

> "Steam makes the position more perilous to England."

I shall next quote the view of a noble and gallant Viscount than whom no braver or better soldier ever lived—Viscount Wolseley. The noble Viscount says—

> "It would be living in a fool's paradise were the English people to depend entirely on the Navy for the defence of this country against invasion."

Again he says—

> "It would be the madness the gods used to send to those whom they wished to destroy. Taking England as a fighting man, it would be like tying one of his arms to his side if you tied your Fleet down to the Channel. Invasion will take place much more quickly than you imagine."

The Earl of Wemyss.

Your Lordships will have observed that I have put off this Motion on several occasions. I did so in the hope that Lord Wolseley would be able to be present in his place in your Lordships' House, but as he has not been able to come I wrote and asked him if he would send me his opinion on the question at issue. Lord Wolseley, in reply, said—

> "You ask me for my views upon the possible invasion of these islands. The subjects is one that I have long studied in all its aspects—"

I am told that he has made a study, in the same way as the Duke of Wellington did, of all the different places on the East Coast where it would be possible to land—

> "The subject is one that I have long studied in all its aspects, learning from history whatever it can teach us upon this somewhat technical and highly professional question. A great deal of nonsense has been written about it. Admirals anxious to see our great and splendid Navy made still greater, preach upon the uselessness, the folly, of spending large sums upon keeping up an Army for home defence. The only fact, I think, necessary to adduce is that England has been successfully invaded in the past, and that, as regards the future, its feasibility was believed in by Napoleon, Nelson, Wellington, and by other great soldiers and sailors in the nineteenth century."

Lord Wolseley then refers to the Duke of Wellington's correspondence with Sir John Burgoyne, and adds—

> "I have not their letters by me, but I remember that in one of them the public was reminded that the invasion of England had recently become a much simpler matter than it was formerly because it was now joined to France by an isthmus of steam."

The very thing which we are told makes us safe is here declared to have made the invasion of England a much simpler matter than it was formerly. Continuing, Lord Wolseley says—

> "May I say without offence to those who preach upon the safety of England as long as we keep up a very powerful Navy, that any great naval combination against us—which is a very possible contingency—might drive our fleets into their harbours. Further, that we have very imperfect *data* upon this modern naval question to warrant us in depending for the safety of these islands exclusively upon the floating ironclad batteries, which, now manned by artillerymen dress d as sailors, have taken the place of the sailing fleets manned by our seamen skilled in the management of ships under sail beyond the sailors of all foreign nations."

I am inclined to think that before the Japanese War the tone of Russia was very much the tone of the blue-water school in this country at the present moment, and they no doubt said that no harm could come to them while they had their splendid fleet. In his speech the Prime Minister talks about the improved state of telegraphy and means of communication which would prevent the possibility of such a decoy as took place with Nelson in 1805 before Trafalgar. We have an object-lesson in the Far East. With all the appliances of the present day, fast steamers, telegraphs, and so forth, did the Russians know where Admiral Togo was? They did not know; and, therefore, the reasons connected with steam which have been given for safety are reasons for the reverse. I will now quote the opinions of two experts in strategy, Mr. T. M. McGuire and Colonel Lonsdale Hale. Mr. McGuire says—

> "I have gone over the statement with regard to the possibilities of successful invasion with some of the ablest naval and military experts in England. We have also considered the chances of a raid which would paralyse our commerce and upset every industry of our people for months on the *data* given in *The Times* report of Mr. Balfour's speech. We have also worked out, in company with able officers, schemes of invasion based on the history of combined naval and military operations before and since the use of steam and the nationalisation of armies; and we have come to the conclusion that Mr. Balfour's speech is not—"

using the words which Mr Balfour applied to the possibility of invasion—

> "is not worthy of serious consideration."

Colonel Lonsdale Hale, in a letter to me on this subject, says—

> "These 'blue-water maniacs' seem so terribly cocksure of what would be the result of one great naval battle."

He heartily endorses paragraph 7 of the Report of the Norfolk Commission, and adds—

> "Even naval enthusiasts do not assert that the victors will have much more kick in them left than the vanquished. Some Power will quietly look on while the combatants smash each other, and that Power will be the one untouched. As to guarding against raids we seem to be judicially blind."

I have nothing more to say upon the question of serious invasion. I have not given my own opinion, but I have quoted authority which I think your Lordships must accept as such. The view I have quoted was the one held by the Duke of Wellington. It has the authority of Cromwell, who said Lord Palmerston was one of the wisest Prime Ministers who ever ruled this country, and what was his view of the blue-water school? He said "that a man must be mad who trusted to the Navy alone."

I pass from the question of serious invasion to that of raids. Now, all these blue-water men tell you that they cannot guarantee you against a raid, and raids are looked upon as rather pleasant interruptions to a monotonous country life on the coast. The Romans, however, took a different view when in occupation of England, for they built the great Roman wall seventy-four miles across the north of England, to protect raiding from the northern scourge, and, later on, when raiding was rife on the Scottish border, on both sides of the Tweed, there was an organisation by the appointment of Lords of the Marches to prevent it. But raids must be regarded from two points of view. You must look upon them as they affect the locality, and also as they affect the share market. Let us take locality first. In non-blue-water days, when there used to be raids, they were not looked upon as desirable things locally, and I very much doubt, the blue-water school notwithstanding, whether a raid would be regarded with pleasure by any of the towns on our east coast. I think they would all of them be asking for that protection from the Navy which, in one of the quotations I gave to the House, it was said would be the result of trusting to the Navy alone for home defence. As to individual properties, do you think the owners would like to have 10,000 men landed near their doors, and their castles or houses occupied? I rather think they would not.

There are two raidable places to which I would refer. One is Whittinghame, the home of the Prime Minister. Some of your Lordships may have read that not only was the Thames raided by Paul Jones, but that there was also an attempt to raid the Scottish coast at Dunbar. But happily for Dunbar, and for the Whittinghame of the day, which is within easy reach of Dunbar, this attempt of Paul Jones was defeated. But how was it defeated? Not only by an adverse wind, but mainly by the prayers of a Kirkcaldy minister. I do not know whether the prayers of a Whittinghame minister would be as powerful if another raid was attempted in that part of the country, but Whittinghame is not more than eight or ten miles from Dunbar and is an easily raidable place. The other most raidable point in Great Britain is Sandringham. I do not, however, wish to dwell upon this question of a raid from the personal point of view, but from the national point of view. The question of the City is an all-important one. Last year when this question was up I asked a Member of this House what the effect would have been in the City if it was known that 10,000 hostile troops had been landed anywhere on our shores, and my friend disliked the question so much that he bolted, shouting, "I don't know." I holloaed after him, and said "But I do." I asked another City man the same question, and his reply was, not that he did not know, but that he knew too well. He said every man who had anything to sell would sell it for what he could get, and Consols would be down to 30.

We have the very definite opinion on this subject of that great financier, Lord Overstone. In 1860 there was a Committee appointed by Mr. Sidney Herbert, then Secretary of State for War, to consider the defences of the United Kingdom. That was forty-five years ago, and we are just as badly off as we were then, and perhaps more so. This Committee turned their attention, in the first instance, to the Channel, and then said—

> "This is the first and most obvious line of defence; but it is one that could not, in our opinion, be entirely relied upon at the present day, even if England had no greater external interests to protect than the countries which may be opposed to her."

The Committee asked Lord Overstone his opinion as to the effect on commercial and monetary affairs that would follow the landing of an invading army, and his answer was—

> "We may be well assured that the general confusion and ruin which the presence of a hostile army on British soil must produce will be such that it would be absolute madness on the part of the Government and people of this country were they to omit any possible measure of precaution, or to shrink from any present sacrifice by which the occurrence of such a catastrophe may be rendered impossible."

Further on he said, when asked as to the probable effect of the invasion of London—

> "I cannot contemplate the consequences of such a supposition. My only answer is—It must never be."

It is in that belief, my Lords, and in the spirit of that answer, that I venture to propose the Resolution which stands in my name. Your Lordships will have observed that I have not given my own opinion. The Resolution practically embodies all I have said in the present stage on the question. It does not say what you are to do. My noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for War smiles, because he does not in the least know what he is going to do.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): I know what the noble Earl wants.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: The Government does nothing except undo what is the safe foundation of our military system in regard to the Militia. You are undoing, you are not doing. There is only one way of dealing with this question, and that is by taking it out of the domain of Party. Surely if foreign affairs are, as a rule, taken out of the domain of Party this question of national defence should be similarly treated. What ought to be done is this. The heads of one side should communicate with the heads of the other and say: "Let us consider what is necessary, no matter what it may be, to render the nation absolutely safe." It should be made so safe as regards our land defences that our fleets may go anywhere the world over, protecting our commerce, destroying the commerce of the enemy, and blockading him and pursuing him everywhere. At home our means of immediate defence should be so perfect that no nation, be they ever so strong, would dream of coming here any more than a sane man would think of putting his head into a roaring furnace. That is what is wanted and what ought to be done. Whether it will be done or not I know not. At any rate, this Resolution of mine, though it does not tell you what to do, is a step in the right direction; and it is in that spirit, and with the hope and belief that it may help to bring about a better state of things, and that something may be done, that I beg to move the Resolution which stands in my name.

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House, it would be a danger to the Realm, and limit the power of the Navy as an offensive force in war, to trust to it alone for home defence, and, inasmuch as it is admitted that the Navy cannot guarantee us against so-called hostile 'raids,' it is the more needful that our land defences should at all times be such that no nation would ever attempt, in any form, a hostile landing on our shores."—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

*EARL ROBERTS: My Lords, I do not propose to discuss directly the question brought forward by the noble Earl, but rather to show that, whether invasions of, or raids on, this country are possible or not, it is essential that we should possess armed forces, fit in all respects not only to protect our own country, but our large possessions abroad. During the last few sessions the subjects of Army reform and Army administration have received a good deal of attention in your Lordships' House, in the House of Commons, and in the public Press. But, so far as I can remember, no allusion has been made, except by the Prime Minister in his speech of May 11th last, to the scope of the demands which the armed forces of this country must be prepared to meet, and how they can best be organised so as to ensure success when called upon to respond to those demands.

We may reform the Army to the end of time, and the system of Army administration may be changed as often as the Government of the day may see fit to change it, and yet we may be no nearer than we are at present to the solution of our difficulties as regards having the kind of Army we require for our peculiar needs and responsibilities. That solution must depend upon a correct, authoritative, and generally-accepted definition of our military requirements both at home and abroad. For, after all, is not that the initial problem which we have to solve? We must take into consideration, not only the protection of these islands, but the protection of the vast commercial interests of our widely scattered Empire, upon which the very existence of the United Kingdom depends.

I much doubt whether the public generally have ever considered the subject in this light, or have ever realised what the armed forces of this country will really have to do should war break out; and, therefore, they have never thought it incumbent upon them to satisfy themselves that these forces are in all respects capable of successfully carrying out any duties they may be called upon to perform. Five years ago the great fact that the life and prosperity of these islands are bound up in the existence of what is now known as the King's "dominions beyond the seas" was forcibly brought home to the British public. For the moment they realised this fact, and, unprepared as they were for any such service, they sprang patriotically to the call made upon them. But five years have passed since then, and other subjects have engaged the attention of the nation; the lessons of South Africa have been forgotten, and I have no hesitation in stating that our armed forces, as a body, are as absolutely unfitted and unprepared for war as they were in 1899–1900. The public still appear to restrict their ideas of precaution to the defence of the shores of this country. They lose sight of the fact that His Majesty's dominions are no longer a kingdom but an Empire, the greatest Empire the world has ever seen, and that if we intend to maintain the integrity of this great Empire, which means the prosperity of Great Britain, we must accept the burden which the responsibilities of such a charge entails. So far as I can judge these are matters in which the pubilc think they have no concern. They are much troubled with the smaller details of home defence, forgetful of the larger issues which mean so much to them, and which may, and probably will, require our being prepared as a Continental nation not only to defend our possessions in the East, but to take an important part in affairs nearer home, either or both of which would necessitate our being able to place in the field an Army as large and as efficient as any that might be brought against us.

If my appreciation of the state of affairs is correct, of what avail is a discussion within the narrow limits of the Motion brought forward by the noble Earl? The question with which we have to deal is one of infinitely greater importance; it may, indeed, be one of life or death to this country, and it cannot, therefore, be left to be settled by some impromptu action when the time of trouble arises. We must calmly consider the dangers with which we may be confronted, and we must do all in our power by timely preparations to ensure our being able to cope successfully with those dangers whenever or wherever they may occur. The mere fact of our doing this would surely put a stop to the annual discussions on the Army Estimates being conducted in what I may be permitted to describe as a somewhat parochial spirit, and would enable us to arrive at some definite decision as to the strength of the Regular Army both for peace and war, also—a matter of supreme importance—as to the part to be taken by the Auxiliary Forces, not only in the defence of these islands, but in the defence of the Empire. This would, moreover, have the inestimable benefit of giving a certainty to Army life, and would obviate that feeling of restlessness which now permeates all ranks, and which is so detrimental to efficiency and to the best interests of the service.

What we have to aim at is to get the people of this country to identify themselves with the Army, and to take an intelligent interest in what the Army may have to do. The peoples of other countries are identified with their armies from the fact that every man has borne his share of military duty, and for the best years of his life is liable to be recalled to the colours. With us, I grieve to say, it is very different; the Army is looked upon as something quite outside the national life. No thought is bestowed by the civil population on the means available for the training of the troops; not only so, but the law is often invoked to protect the rights of individuals against the requirements of military training.

Modern war is not now a matter of brute force, as was more or less the case in former days. Both officers and men now need to be most carefully trained. The officers must be given every opportunity of educating themselves to accept responsibility, and to carry out intelligently the arduous duties, either as staff officers or commanders, upon which success in the field mainly depends. The men must be given the means to practise shooting, so as to be able to use their rifles with skill and confidence when required to do so. But, I would ask you, how is it possible for these essentials to be obtained when manœuvring areas are so seldom available, and when year after year funds necessary for manœuvres are cavilled at, and either considerably reduced or denied altogether; when even ordinary training grounds are only obtained with the greatest difficulty, where ranges are few and far between, and where people object to the presence of troops in their immediate neighbourhood—one class because the noise of firing may disturb their game, another class because of an unreasonable fear that soldiers may create disturbance—a fear entirely due to their ignorance of military life, and which has been entirely dispelled, I rejoice to think, in those places which have had soldiers amongst them during manœuvres?

I am not exaggerating. These very excuses have been made to me personally as reasons why manœuvres should not be held, or gun and rifle ranges established, in this or that particular locality. And yet it is this Army, reduced to a minimum in numbers, trained in a most inadequate manner, with far too little musketry practice, and without the Auxiliary Forces so organised as to form a sufficient and efficient Reserve—a Reserve which can never be provided by the Regular troops, by reason of the conditions of our service—it is this Army, I say, which the nation expects to perform the most trying and difficult service in foreign countries without ever a mistake, and which is condemned when a disaster occurs consequent on its want of training. It is this Army which is expected to uphold the honour of the country against whatever odds may be opposed to it.

When war breaks out there is a sudden change of feeling towards the soldier; too much cannot then be done for him, money is freely spent in providing him with comforts, on the sick and wounded, and in looking after the women and children; and I am sure that every soldier was most grateful for all that was done in this way during the war in South Africa. But, my Lords, should patriotism end here? This evanescent enthusiasm does not entail any self-sacrifice, and it passes off as soon as war is over, and the danger has disappeared. When we consider the grievous disadvantages under which our officers and men labour I think it is nothing short of marvellous that His Majesty's troops should so often and so successfully have performed the severe and onerous duties which have from time to time been required of them in various parts of the world.

But surely such a haphazard state of affairs should no longer be allowed to continue. Will our fellow-countrymen never realise the very grave risks we run—courting disaster, in fact—in attempting to maintain our position in the world under such eminently inadequate conditions as now exist, and when all the nations in Europe are so many nations in arms? How can we expect to protect our own interests and keep our Empire intact unless the whole nation will rise to the occasion by either personally bearing their share in the defence of the Empire or by enabling those to whom they delegate this responsible duty to become in all respects efficient for the work?

I offer these remarks because I feel that I should be signally failing in my duty to the nation were I to keep silent on a subject which is of such supreme importance to its future prosperity—indeed, I may say, to its existence as a first-class Power. I have long wished for an opportunity of telling my fellow-countrymen what I believed to be the true state of our armed forces, and what I believed to be in store for them unless they bestir themselves to remedy our great shortcomings. I have no intention of blaming the present Government, or any former Government, for having failed fully to realise the military requirements of the British Empire. For is not every Government inspired and actuated by the national sentiment? And if that sentiment is apathetic or merely critical, how can we expect a Government to take any decided action towards national improvements?

It is to the people of the country I appeal to take up the question of the Army in a sensible, practical manner. For the sake of all they hold dear, let them bring home to themselves what would be the position of Great Britain if it were to lose its wealth, its power, its position. I would ask them not to allow the Army to be the shuttlecock of Party politics, or its organisation to be dependent on fanciful theories. The people of this country should return no Members to Parliament upon whom they cannot depend to make a study of the services the armed forces may have to perform, and to consider in a broad and liberal spirit under what system of organisation those duties can most effectually be carried out.

We do not require a large standing Army. It is comparatively easy to come to a satisfactory conclusion as to what the constitution and strength of that Army should be. It must continue to be constituted on the voluntary system, because one-half is always abroad while the other half is preparing to go abroad, and there are certain fixed quantities by which its strength must be guided—as, for instance, the number of men required to garrison India, South Africa, Malta, Gibraltar, etc., and, in addition, the number of men required annually as drafts to keep the several units abroad up to the established strength. Behind this standing Army there must be a Reserve large enough to mobilise all the Regular troops, and to expand the Army to and maintain it at such a size as circumstances may require. It is this Reserve to which attention must be chiefly paid. The Regular troops, as I have already explained, can only provide a very limited portion of the Reserve, the main body of which must be formed by the Auxiliary Forces and by the manhood of the country generally. It is for the people of this country to decide how this Reserve is to be brought about, whether by conscription or by some practical system of universal training. For in no other way is it possible for Great Britain to possess an Army so organised and trained in peace time as to be equal to the probable demands of the Empire in war.

*Lord ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, though I partly belong to the blue-water school myself, I think that it is best to have two strings to one's bow. The blue-water school would, I think, be more suitably named if it was called the "single-string school." At present, however, when compared with other nations, that "single string" is a very strong one, and if it is not cut by surprise it may be found sufficient to protect us, provided we keep up a moderately strong Army. As for the dinghy school, those who believe that no body of troops, however small, can ever be landed in this country, I sincerely hope that posterity will never have a chance of comparing it with the "gaiter-button school" which brought so many disasters upon France in 1870. A single ship can land 5,000 men.

It has recently been stated that France is not likely to have in her harbours at any one time more than a 100,000 tons of shipping, and that this amount is insufficient to carry 70,000 men; that the French estimate for that number is 210,000 tons; and that our Admiralty estimate is 250,000 tons. When the Prime Minister said this, I think that he must have misunderstood his advisers, and mixed up the quantity of tonnage necessary for a voyage of twenty days to the Cape with that required for a passage of about twenty hours in the Channel or North Sea. On referring to the Board of Trade "Instructions as to the survey of passenger accommodation," I find that what is termed the home trade includes the United Kingdom and all that part of Europe which lies between the River Elbe and Brest. It therefore includes all the lines of steamers running from England to Hamburg, Rotterdam, Flushing, Antwerp, Ostend, Calais, Boulogne, Dieppe, Havre, St. Malo, and Cherbourg, lines with many of which your Lordships must be acquainted. In the home trade, a deck space of nine square feet and one ton of gross tonnage is allowed for each passenger. So that, according to our own Board of Trade rules, 70,000 tons would be allowed to carry 70,000 passengers to or from the Continent if the deck space was sufficient. Our excursion steamers are under somewhat different rules. Each passenger must have nine square feet of deck space, but there is no tonnage limit whatever. These vessels run all over the Channel. Folkestone boats may go as far as Newhaven, and *vice-versa.* Dover boats may go to Newhaven or Sheerness. They must, however, be "of such substantial character as to be capable of standing bad weather if caught in it."

I am presuming that an enemy would bring infantry, dismounted cavalry, and artillery without horses, but that he would carry a few horses for officers. There are plenty of horses in England. In considering the question of tonnage, the enemy's guns and ammunition need scarcely be taken into account, as their weight would form useful ballast for the troopships. The weight of one of our thirteen-pounder six gun batteries of Horse Artillery with 176 rounds per gun may be taken at about thirty tons. A soldier carrying three days' provisions, knapsack, rifle, great coat, and water bottle, would individually take up much less space than a passenger with the average amount of hand luggage allowed under the one-ton rule, but he would require somewhat more than the ordinary excursionist, to whom the one-ton rule does not apply. Still, as the troops would be under discipline, they would pack much closer than excursionists, and would not endanger the ship by running from one side of the ship to the other like a Bank-holiday crowd. For a raid, or a surprise invasion, I do not think that an enemy would ever allow more than one gross ton per man, as an average. Ships are, however, built in very different shapes, and some can carry much more than others in proportion to their gross tonnage.

It has also been laid down that the enemy's fleet of transports would either come from Cherbourg or from Brest. Now, if it is presumed that an enemy would make every conceivable mistake it is easy enough to beat him on paper. France has ten harbours on her north coast. On her west coast there are at least five. At all these ports troops could be embarked. It would be a very difficult thing to assemble 70,000 men at any one harbour such as Cherbourg or Brest without attracting notice. Besides, the overcrowding would cause confusion, whereas if from five to ten thousand men were to be embarked at each of the different harbours that I have referred to, it could be done with much less trouble, and there would be no need for any large assemblage either of ships or men at any one place. If a powerful enemy were to invade France, and we decided to send every available man to her assistance with the least possible delay, we should embark our soldiers simultaneously on the banks of the Tyne, the Humber, and the Thames, besides making use of seven or more harbours in the Channel; we should not think of restricting ourselves to the use of one harbour only.

Germany possesses at least nine harbours on the coast of the North Sea at which she could embark troops, to say nothing of those she holds in the Baltic. Her gross available steam tonnage is more than double that of France. If only modern steel ships are considered it is treble that of France. No less than 1,260,000 tons of her commerce are in the hands of two companies only, a circumstance which would greatly facilitate concentration of steam tonnage at any prearranged time or place. If a country that disposed of an armed force of 3,000,000 men were to attempt to invade us with 70,000 men and we drowned every man of them, its loss would be less than 2½ per cent. of the total force at its disposal. Some wives and mothers might weep, but the strength of our adversary would remain practically unimpaired.

Many theories that I consider to be quite untenable have also been deduced from our last year's raid at Clacton-on-sea. I therefore thought it worth while to spend a week-end there, and to take a large scale Admiralty chart with me. Among other things it is assumed that an enemy's force would take as long to disembark as ours did, but it would be unwise to suppose that an enemy's troops would, like ours, have had no previous training in landing on a beach. Besides, our expedition might have been better equipped with more modern appliances. Mr. Arnold-Forster has drawn a harrowing picture of the fleet of transports waiting all night at anchor, exposed to an attack from torpedo-boats. But the War Office had issued instructions declaring that the command of the sea was to be considered as definitely and completely secured and that no naval opposition of any kind was to be expected. Had it been otherwise, had it been a real war, and not a make-believe manœuvre, very different tactics would probably have been adopted.

My solution of the problem may not be the best, but I would suggest that the transports might, during daylight, one hour after high water, have been run on shore after letting go stern anchors, not only at Clacton, but at Little Holland, where they would have been closer to the shore. Being nearer to the beach the troops would have been landed in less time. Then, though torpedo-boats might have damaged some of the vessels they could not have sunk a single ship nor have drowned a single soldier. Being unsupported by battleships, the torpedo squadron would probably have lost half its numbers in breaking through the screen of protecting cruisers, and half the remainder in trying to return to a place of safety. Some of the invaders' guns would, as soon as landed, have been placed in positions which would have enabled them to assist in the protection of the transports. In peace manœuvres the value of the lost or damaged vessels would, of course, have to be considered, and expense is one of the reasons that make manœuvres so unreal. We are, I believe, right to continue them, but one hour of Russo-Japanese experience is worth a month of manœuvres.

Under our present arrangements our Home and Channel Fleets should never be sent to a distance from our coasts for fear of a naval surprise. If we were at war with any one Power, a large naval force would have to be kept in home waters for the purpose of watching neutrals. Until the principle of universal home service in some form or another is adopted, I shall always have the greatest sympathy with all Secretaries and Under-Secretaries of State for War, whoever they may be, and whatever Parties they may belong to. They may organise and reorganise, change the names of everything twice a year, but whatever money they may spend, and however able and industrious they may be, they cannot under our present laws give us an Army capable of defending our unique position on the surface of this globe. The conditions of the problem are perpetually changing, but if we look the dangers of raids or invasions straight in the face, never allow ourselves to minimise them, or to deceive ourselves about our real position, we shall be able to ward them off. If, however, we declare them to be visionary and impossible, we shall run a great risk of being exposed to the disagreeable reality.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, we entirely agree with the noble and gallant Field-Marshal who spoke second as to the necessity of taking a broad view at all times of our military requirements, and I am sure the noble and gallant Earl will have noticed that the speech of the Prime Minister, which is so much under discussion this evening, was essentially one possessing the attributes which he considered so necessary. It was certainly not a parochial speech, to use the noble and gallant Earl's own phrase; it was a speech dealing not only with this country, but with the needs of India and the Colonies; and I am perfectly certain that the noble and gallant Earl in his efforts to interest the public in the Army will find allies on both sides of the House.

I turn to the Motion which has been moved by the noble Earl at the Table, and it may, perhaps, be convenient if I state at once what are the intentions of His Majesty's Government with regard to it. The Motion contains two very tangible statements, and I for one would certainly not quarrel with either of them. The Motion first of all states that it would be unwise to trust to the Navy alone for home defence. I think that is a statement that everyone will agree with. I am not aware, indeed, of anyone having expressed a contrary view. At the same time the noble Earl, I am sure, will admit that there is a danger in certain quarters of a statement such as this being misunderstood. There is the danger of considering the Navy as a unit, whereas it is nothing of the kind. It is a collection of different units, some of which can very rightly be looked to to take their share in home defence. I merely mention this, because I think it is a fact which is too often forgotten in dealing with the important question to which the noble Earl has turned his attention this evening. The Motion goes on to state that it is needful that our land defences should at all times be such that no nation would ever attempt in any form a hostile landing on our shores. My Lords, I think that, like the first, is a self-evident truth; and, as the Motion contains two statements which are practically axioms, I need not say that it is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to ask your Lordships to vote against it.

But when I have said this about the Motion I have not said all that is to be said upon the debate that we have had upon it. The Motion only touches the fringe of the subject. I regret that, but, of course, I do not question the right of the noble Earl to move the Motion in any form he pleases. I pass on to refer, very briefly, to some of the points made by the noble Earl in the course of his speech, points which were not so much aimed at commending his Motion to your Lordships as aimed at the Prime Minister's speech of May 11th. The noble Earl first of all expressed surprise that a speech which he considers incautious should have come from a Scotsman. As a humble Member of your Lordships' House who is not a Scotsman, but who has the greatest respect for the Scottish nation, I might perhaps be allowed to say that the fact that the speech was made by a Scotsman is almost sufficient proof that it was not incautious. But, passing from that point, I would remind your Lordships what this speech was. The speech consisted of an exposition of the reasoned conclusions of the Defence Committee after, I think, rather more than a year's work.

But what were the authorities which the noble Earl brought against these conclusions of the Defence Committee? First of all, he quoted a recent German novel. I am not appalled by that. Personally I have no time to read novels, but I did skim through a translation of the book to which the noble Earl referred, and I am bound to say that my belief in the conclusions of the Defence Committee—that is to say, in the combined conclusions of the political, naval, and military experience of the Empire—has not been shaken by what is, after all, only a "shilling shocker," although it may be clothed in the decency of a foreign language. Then the noble Earl went on to quote evidence given before the Norfolk Commission. Royal Commissions are so thoroughgoing in their investigations that you can nearly always be sure, in going through the evidence of a Royal Commission, of finding portions to prove almost any view in connection with the subject with which you are concerned.

The noble Earl should remember that all that evidence was available to the Defence Committee when they came to their decision. The Report and evidence of the Royal Commission have been in print since last July, and there was obviously plenty of time for the Defence Committee and the Government—for the Defence Committee has no authority save as an advisory body to the Government—to weigh all the evidence in coming to the decision at which they arrived.

Then the noble Earl went on to quote other authorities. He quoted Lord Wolseley. I am going to say nothing whatever depreciatory of Lord Wolseley, but as a humble student in the realms of history I cannot help thinking that Lord Wolseley in his letter was quoting a very bad witness when he cited Lord Nelson as being opposed to the idea that the Navy could guarantee us against foreign invasion. My humble opinion always has been that Lord Nelson very strongly believed in the efficiency of the Fleet to protect us from foreign invasion, and I see this fact was mentioned by the Prime Minister in his speech. The noble Earl then went on to quote the letter which he so kindly printed and sent round to your Lordships—the letter written by the Duke of Wellington. He also quoted the opinion of Oliver Cromwell and Lord Palmerston. I would only urge one thing against the very interesting pamphlet which the noble Lord sent round, and that is that the letter of the Duke of Wellington cannot by any stretch of imagination be claimed as applying to the problem as it now exists.

The proof of that is in the letter itself, for what does the writer say? In the first paragraph the Duke of Wellington speaks of having received a note from Sir John Burgoyne discussing the state of affairs under "our present system of military preparation." That, my Lords, was sixty years ago. Later on there are other sentences in the letter which show that the Duke of Wellington was thinking of the forces at that time. The letter was not meant to be a general treatise on the question of home defence, and I do maintain that the decision arrived at by the Defence Committee after consultation with the military and naval authorities must necessarily be vastly more valuable than an opinion expressed in a private letter sixty years ago, the writer of which obviously could not know the peculiar circumstances underlying the problem at the present day.

I would only say one or two words with reference to the subject of steam. The noble Earl adopts the view of the Duke of Wellington, arrived at when steam was in its infancy and when its real powers were not fairly understood, that steam is all in favour of attack, and he neglects altogether the improvements that steam has made possible in the organisation of the defence. I would remind your Lordships that steam leads to concentration, that concentration is vastly helped by wireless telegraphy, and that it is to concentration that we must look as our great help in the defence of these islands. The noble Earl concluded his speech by an eloquent appeal to your Lordships to treat this matter in a non-Party manner. I am confident that that is an appeal which will be fully acceded to by your Lordships; and I am sure the noble Earl will have noticed that the spirit underlying that appeal was felt by both Parties in the debate which took place upon the Prime Minister's speech in the other House. I would remind your Lordships that the decision of the Defence Committee is not a hurried decision; it is a reasoned decision come to after months of labour; it is a practical decision founded on facts as they exist at the present time; and it is one which, I think, should not be lightly rejected on the opinion of former authorities, however eminent, who at any rate cannot be claimed as having been cognisant of present day facts.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: My Lords, I asked myself, on reading the speech of the Prime Minister, what his object was in making it, what impression he intended to convey, and whether it had been conveyed. The Prime Minister stated that he hoped that it would be possible by the decision of the Defence Committee to put an end to the wrangling which had existed between different schools and between the military and naval departments. That was a sanguine hope. I doubt whether these wrangles will come to a conclusion, notwithstanding the view taken by the Defence Committee. The Prime Minister put his examination of the case—a most careful and brilliant examination—before the House of Commons in considerable detail. He dealt with it as a concrete case. Concrete problems have been put before the authorities of the War Office and the Admiralty before, and the public ought not to be allowed to think that these problems have not been attacked in the same spirit by previous Administrations.

The merit of the Defence Committee has been to bring the matter to a crisis; but the examination took place in precisely the same form in the beginning of 1891, and a Report was made in 1894. It is an interesting piece of history that the War Office approached the Admiralty and put the hypothesis of the bulk of the Fleet being away, and asked what, given certain circumstances, would happen in that case. The reply was that the idea was so inconceivable, so preposterous, that it would be a waste of time to assume that the Navy would be away. However, the War Office insisted; and in the end two distinguished naval officers, two distinguished military officers joining them, examined into the problem in exactly the same way as it was put to the Defence Committee by the Prime Minister, with the one distinction that they assumed a landing of 100,000 men, whereas the Prime Minister assumed 70,000 men. They made exact calculations as to the tonnage required to carry the invading troops, what ships the foreigners possessed, what provisions they would require, how many water-tanks would be necessary, and how many hours of daylight would be required to disembark the troops They studied the history of previous invasions and omitted nothing that bore on the question under examination.

The naval and military officers made separate memoranda, which were read by Ministers with the same interest and anxiety with which your Lordships must have read the speech of the Prime Minister. Ought they to have been published? The documents seemed to me to be conclusive against the possibility of invasion. The language used was very strong, and was to the effect that the possibility was beyond the necessity of being taken into serious consideration. The question whether these documents framed so many years ago ought to have been published involved the consideration of the calculations I have referred to. Would it have been wise to publish these calculations, to put out all these details for foreigners to criticise? I think it would be awkward if they were put before French and German candidates for promotion, with directions to find flaws in them. I expect that there may be flaws which would suggest themselves to the eyes of foreigners. There is this flaw, of course, that the hypothesis is based simply on the attack of one Power, whereas all our naval strategy has been based on the possibility of two Powers being associated. If part of the plans are published where is it to stop? The nation will ask awkward questions. Are those questions to be answered? They may say, "We are satisfied with your conclusions as they stand, but supposing there were two Powers?" When I was at the Admiralty I was sounded as to whether I would give a guarantee that the Navy would be able to resist every form of invasion. I declined altogether to give that guarantee, because I felt that there was so much of the element of the unforeseen which could not be left out of consideration in a matter of this supreme importance. We have seen the unforeseen occur in foreign countries, and, in regard to our own South African War, I think most military officers would have guaranteed that 15,000 British troops would have been able to hold Ladysmith, because it was assumed that it was impossible to bring the big guns from Pretoria, and mount them over Ladysmith. In the same way the naval authorities did not believe that it was possible to use the 4·7 guns on shore as they were used. War develops a number of possibilities which the most acute forecast of military and naval experience can scarcely reach; and, therefore, in a matter of this immense importance, while the case may seem clear on paper, there are certain conditions which must be kept in view at the same time.

What is likely to be the effect on the Reserve Forces of the suggestion that invasion is impossible? Will it not lead them to feel that they are, after all, only an ornamental force? It must be remembered that it was the idea of invasion that created the Volunteer force, and it would have a very bad effect upon them if they were discouraged in any way. Would it not be more difficult, if a trying time ever came again, to find such a force as was sent to South Africa? Any discouragement of our Reserve Forces would, I believe, affect our resources very materially. The value of the Volunteer does not only consist in his being a good shot and well disciplined. It is also admitted that there is great advantage in the military knowledge which he obtains, and that he could on that account be more easily and quickly turned into an efficient soldier than the rustic or the town clerk who had never been in the ranks. The existence of the force familiarises the country generally with what a soldier ought to be, and arouses a certain interest in military matters in every part of the country.

It is quite possible that there are some extreme opponents of militarism who would regret that; but, looking to the duties that are before this Empire, I think that a movement which strengthens an interest throughout the country in military affairs is greatly to the advantage of the country; and, therefore, I would deplore it deeply if the result—it is not intended to be so—of Mr. Balfour's speech should be in any way, not only to discourage the Volunteers, but to produce an impression in the country that our efforts are to be relaxed because our splendid Navy has given a guarantee that our shores are inviolable. I have addressed your Lordships mainly in order to deprecate such a result as that from the speech of the Prime Minister. A speech guaranteeing the country against invasion may be a powerful argument in the hands of those who wish to reduce our military forces, but I do not for a moment hold that the present situation of Europe and the world is such that we can to any extent lessen the efforts we are obliged to make.

May I be allowed to say one word with regard to raids. I must say I feel inclined to agree with my noble friend, Lord Wemyss, on that point. I think sufficient attention was not given to raids in the speech of the Prime Minister. Raids were scarcely dealt with at all, yet they are a most important subject for discussion, and I have no doubt the Defence Committee has examined that question and gone into it. But there, again, arises the wisdom of publicity in this matter. As they have published their views on the subject of invasion, the country will say, "We want to know how we stand against raids?" The big towns may say, "What measures of defence can be extended to us?" It is, I venture to say, a problem that has to be worked out with as much care, and in as much detail, as the other problem with which the Committee have dealt so exhaustively. The noble Earl who raised this discussion dwelt on the question of panic. I associate myself to a very great extent with what he said. But I will put an argument to which he gave no prominence, but which, I think, is a very important argument, and that is that any idea of the possibility of raids on the coast when war breaks out might disorganise the plans of the Government and the arrangements for sending out a military expedition, because every locality would clamour for a certain portion of the troops to be kept at home. Assuming the guarantee of the Government that we are safe, we cannot guard against panic, notwithstanding the investigations which have been made. Having regard to all the circumstances, I cannot with equanimity look upon any decrease in our military forces.

But I am open to conviction. Let it be examined. Let us know what raid is possible. Is a raid of 10,000 men possible? Is a raid of 20,000 men possible? On that a great deal depends. But, quite irrespective of the actual danger, the very belief that raids are possible would have a terrible effect on the feeling and disposition of the country. I do not quite agree with the answer given to Lord Wemyss by some one in the City, that if 10,000 men were landed Consols would fall to 30. I do not go to that length. A panic might be produced which would disorganise the Government in their plans of defence. That is a much more probable eventuality. There was another part of the defence of the country with which, I think, the Prime Minister did not deal adequately—the question of the Colonies. The defence of the Colonies is closely wrapped up with the defence of these shores, and we must deal with the problem as a whole. From what I have heard I have doubt as to what progress the Government have made in their plans for utilising the military arrangements of the Australian and other Colonies and working them into a general result.

In addition, we see that the situation has changed vastly, owing to the altered international situation. Colonies which were formerly so far removed from possible danger that they might, so to speak, snap their fingers at the world and fail to realise the enormous necessity of remaining firm to the Imperial connection are now in a different position. The international situation has rendered necessary various changes in the disposition of our naval forces. I think the concentration of our main fleets near home, which has been carried out with so much resolution and courage by Lord Selborne, was a wise move, and I am inclined to pay a high tribute to him, because I know how difficult it is to move in such matters, looking to the traditions of the Navy and naval officers on whose advice one must rely. As to St. Lucia, Bermuda, Hong-Kong, and other colonies I am not so satisfied; but I admit the general principle that, if your opponent's forces are either diminished or increased, it requires a revision of your policy with regard to them. It may be necessary, therefore, when Powers grow or decay, grow or become weakened, to readjust the forces you are going to set against them. You must distribute your forces differently. It is said that there has been a frightful waste of money in the expenditure which has taken place on certain posts which we are now evacuating, or almost evacuating. If that policy, however, was justified in a former international situation, it does not follow that those who were responsible for that expenditure deserve blame.

Viscount Goschen.

I have considered it my duty to make this speech. I am sure the object of the Prime Minister was patriotic. As one who has served at the Admiralty and can claim, I think, to have looked into these questions with as much attention, interest, and anxiety as the members of the present Defence Committee, it has been my desire to convey my impression that whilst the facts in the argument of the Prime Minister were very powerful, they ought not to have too great an effect upon the nation in placing a band of complacent security upon their eyes. In the speech of the Prime Minister we can see that he is alive to the necessities with which I have dealt; but at the same time the speech has produced the impression that great changes may now be undertaken in our military forces which before the production of that remarkable evidence it would never have been safe to undertake.

Lord NEWTON: My Lords, I venture to think that the importance of the Resolution moved by the noble Earl has been somewhat overshadowed by the speech of the noble and gallant Field Marshal on the Cross Benches. I have listened to a good many military debates in this House, but I do not recollect hearing any statement made which approached the importance of that of the speech delivered by the noble and gallant Earl. That speech will, I hope, be studied by persons who have hitherto paid little or no attention to the question of national defence, and I trust it will induce them to think on the subject. I cannot help wondering whether the speech will not make the Prime Minister also think on the subject. The views of the Prime Minister have no doubt given considerable satisfaction to many people. They have no doubt given satisfaction to the adherents of the blue-water school, and to all those who consistently refuse to anticipate any danger to this country; and nothing suits a certain class of people better than to be told that if we would only consent to spend a certain amount of money on ironclads everything else may be left to take care of itself.

No country on paper, apparently, enjoys such absolute security as this country. First of all, we have the Secretary of State for War announcing that without his permission a boat's crew cannot land upon these shores; and the Prime Minister improves upon that statement and tells the country that with our Army absent and with our Fleet absent it is equally impossible for an expedition to land upon these shores. This statement appeared so overwhelmingly optimistic that apparently it has been found necessary to interpret it, and the noble Viscount, whose exact position I am not quite clear upon, has come forward as the interpreter, unofficial or official, of the Prime Minister, and has explained, if my recollection has not failed me, that the Prime Minister's views apply to today and to to-morrow, but not to the day after to-morrow, whereas I confess it was my impression that the Defence Committee existed for the purpose of studying complications in the future.

If everybody expressed the same optimistic views we might be perfectly happy, but in addition to Lord Esher, whom I have quoted, we now have the noble and gallant Earl coming forward and telling us in so many words that the nation which does not prepare for war in peace is preparing disaster for itself; that we alone among civilised nations have refused to learn the lesson of the war; and that the country which enters unarmed into a life-and-death struggle with an organised and prepared enemy is courting its own destruction. In other words, what Lord Roberts says is that with our haphazard hand-to-mouth voluntary system it will be impossible for us to face a conflict with an organised enemy whose military power is based on the principle accepted by modern civilised States.

The statement of the Prime Minister contained two most important propositions. One of them is that it is impossible to invade these shores. I will say nothing upon this point because I am not competent to discuss the question, and we know that all the most eminent authorities are disagreed upon it; but the other most important proposition is this, that the Indian or Afghan frontier is the only place in the world where we are likely to be called upon to conduct serious military operations. This is a contention which, I venture to think, any person with the most elementary knowledge of modern history or politics is competent to criticise. I should like to ask, who is there in this House or outside it, whether it be the Prime Minister or an ordinary citizen of this country, who can predict with any sort of certainty where we shall be called upon to fight on land?

Is there anything in the history of the last century or the former century which justifies this assumption? Can anyone predict with certainty even upon which Continent we may be called upon to fight? It is quite true that probabilities indicate that when we have to embark on a contest on land with a great Power the country in which we shall have to fight will be Afghanistan or the neighbouring region. But it is surely obvious that there are other places on the globe where we might conceivably be called upon to fight, if not actually for our existence, at all events in a more important struggle than we have been involved in for many years. It might be in Asia Minor; it might be in Egypt; it might be again in South Africa; it might be in the New World—which Heaven forbid!—or upon the Continent of Europe, not so far from these shores. I venture to think that if anybody ten years ago had predicted that we should find it necessary to send 400,000 men to South Africa he would have been looked upon as little better than an imbecile. These contingencies may seem improbable, but, as the late Secretary of State for War observed on another occasion, we cannot afford to run our Empire on an off-chance. Noble Lords sitting on both Front Benches know that the only real way of efficient preparation for war is to adopt the principle of universal service, as has been pointed out by Lord Roberts and by two Royal Commissions.

What was the most important conclusion arrived at by the Elgin Commission? It was that the true lesson of the war, in their opinion, was that no military system would be satisfactory which did not contain powers of extension outside the limits of the Regular Forces of the Crown, whatever those limits might be; and the Norfolk Commission pointed out how that expansion was to be obtained. Now, I ask, what has been done to obtain this force outside the limits of the Regular Forces of the Crown? For five years, if not more, we have been talking of reform and efficiency; Ministers have come and Ministers have gone; Commanders-in-Chief have come and gone; Army Councils have come; Defence Committees have sat; Commissions have reported; and what is there to show for it? Where are the powers of extension to which I have alluded and to which Lord Roberts alluded; and where is that national force which alone will enable us to grapple with a great emergency? When that great emergency does come again, as no doubt it will, Heaven forbid that it should find us still discussing such questions as the reorganisation of the War Office, want of officers in the Militia, behaviour of cadets at Sandhurst, waste of stores in South Africa, and other subjects which have occupied our attention during past sessions.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, there is one portion of the question which has not been touched upon. I understand that it is proposed to take the defence of our harbours away from those to whom it is at present entrusted, and to place it in the hands of naval officers. I think that would be a very grave error, and I am sure the noble and distinguished Field Marshal will agree. The Engineers have done their work splendidly, and if we were so unfortunate as to be engaged in a great naval war we should require every single naval officer there. I wished just to point that out.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, in the course of the interesting speech delivered by the noble Viscount who sits behind me, he dealt with much emphasis on the fact that the great problem put by the Prime Minister before the House of Commons in the remarkable speech which we are discussing to-night was not raised for the first time by Mr. Balfour, but that it was a problem with which other Ministers had no less concerned themselves. My noble friend is perfectly right. I, for one, can recall interesting discussions when, if not exactly the same problem, at any rate problems closely resembling it were raised by the Admiralty or by the War Office, as the case might be. But I think there is this difference between the position which resulted from those earlier discussions and the position which has now developed itself, that owing to the manner in which the reconstituted Defence Committee has been able to deal with these problems the Government of the day is able, with the full weight of the authority of its military and naval advisers, to state to the public plainly and definitely what conclusions have been arrived at after a full interchange of views between the Departments concerned. My noble friend suggested, although I do not know that he pressed his suggestion very hard, that it was questionable whether conclusions of this kind should have been laid before the public at all. I fully appreciate the nature of the misgivings of my noble friend. On the other hand, it does seem to me that in these days, when these questions of Imperial defence are so fully discussed and possess such an overwhelming interest to the people of this country, it is impossible to keep back from them conclusions such as those which the Defence Committee and His Majesty's Government have arrived at in this case. We are constantly pressed to tell the people of this country what our Army is intended to do, what our Navy is for; and unless we are able to answer those questions, and answer them categorically, I fear we shall find it difficult to justify the great sacrifices to which we ask the taxpayers of this country to submit.

My Lords, the Motion of the noble Earl, and I am afraid I must add several of the speeches to which we have listened this evening, seem to me to proceed upon a fundamental misapprehension of the proposition which the Prime Minister enunciated. I will quote from the Resolution—

> "To move to resolve 'That, in the opinion of this House, it would be a danger to the Realm and limit the power of the Navy as an offensive force in war, to trust to it alone for home defence.'"

Now, my Lords, who, sitting on these benches or connected with His Majesty's Government, has been found to say for one moment that we were prepared to trust to the Navy, and the Navy alone, for home defence? Not only did Mr. Balfour say nothing of the kind in the speech which has been referred to, but he said the contrary. He said it in terms. He assumed throughout his argument the existence of sufficient land forces for the purposes of home defence. Here are his words—

> "We assume land defences, we assume Volunteers, we assume Militia, we assume a residue of Regulars."

and then further on he goes on to say—

> "So that an effective home force is assumed in the very statement of the problem we are attempting to solve."

Well, my Lords, is it fair, in the face of those explicit declarations of Mr. Balfour's, to tax him, and to tax those who think with him, with being out-and-out members of what you are pleased to call the blue-water school, and as being content to rely exclusively upon naval defence for the security of these islands? The noble Lord who spoke just now referred—it is not for the first time that it has been done—to a statement attributed to my right hon. colleague Mr. Arnold-Forster, who is represented as having said that he would undertake to guarantee that even a boat's crew should not land on these shores. Mr. Arnold-Forster said nothing of the kind. He was describing the extreme blue-water school, and he said that he believed there were some people who would be found to contend that even the crew of a dinghy could not land with safety on these shores. We are, I think, entitled to beg that when our opinions are quoted in this House they may be quoted with some approach to accuracy.

Now, let me turn for one moment to the problem as it was put by Mr. Balfour in his speech. He desired to assume a condition of things as unfavourable as possible to this country. He assumed that the Army was abroad, as it was in the year 1900 at the outset of the South African War, and, let me say in passing, is not that a very extreme assumption? Is it very likely that we shall be again at war with a Power possessing no fleet, and therefore at war under conditions which rendered it possible for us at the very commencement of hostilities to send the whole of our Army across the sea. Then the Prime Minister assumed that our main fleets were engaged at a distance from home. Again, I say, is not that also an extreme assumption? Is it likely that our fleets would be occupied in waters remote from this country and that simultaneously the greater portion of our Regular Army would be absent from these islands? I take it that before any large proportion of that Regular Army is likely to be sent abroad we shall have endeavoured to take some steps, at all events, to establish our superiority at sea. Well, what was the next assumption? It was that a sudden and secret concentration of troops and of the transports necessary for the conveyance of those troops had taken place at some port not distant from our coast, and that, finally, this force, assumed to be a force of 70,000 men, had been successfully conveyed across the Channel, and not less successfully disembarked. Now it is only after the whole of those somewhat improbable conditions have been fulfilled that the military problem pure and simple begins—I mean the problem of the resistance to be offered to the invading force by the land forces of this country—and it is not until then that the result of what Lord Goschen so well called the unforeseen would begin to be felt. Then, and not till then, will our land forces find themselves opposed to the invading force. Well, is it true that when that moment arrives we shall be so entirely unprovided with the means of resistance as has been supposed? We shall have the remains of our Regular Army; we shall have the Militia; we shall have the Volunteers, and I should hope that with those forces we should be able to render a good account of any invading force that landed on our coasts. That, at any rate, is certainly an aspect of the problem of which we have not lost sight; and we are determined that those Auxiliary Forces, on which in the case I am supposing we should have to rely, shall be both so sufficient in numbers and so efficient in point of armament and equipment as to render them fit for the duty which they would in that case have to perform.

But is it of any use to attempt to separate the military and the naval problems? The two problems are really one and indissoluble. There may be people whose minds are so constituted that they are content to say, "Give us a strong Army, fortify this country sufficiently, and we do not much care what happens to the Fleet." There may be others who will tell you that if your Fleet is sufficiently strong you need concern yourself very little with your land defences. We have nothing to do with either of these extremist schools. In our opinion we must consider naval and military defences together; and military and naval defences were so considered by the Prime Minister in his recent speech. And surely we may take this for granted, that, however we may regard the matter, anyone who undertakes to invade this country will certainly look not only at the naval but also at the military problem. Will the invader not ask himself two questions—in the first place, "What kind of resistance am I likely to encounter in reaching my destination," and, secondly, "What further resistance am I likely to encounter after I have reached it."

The Marquess of Lansdowne.

Then there is another proposition which is indirectly affirmed in the Motion of the noble Lord; the Motion suggests that by relying on the Navy we limit its power as an offensive force. I venture to say that that proposition shows an entire misapprehension of the *rôle* which we intend—and I believe not only the present Lords of the Admiralty but their predecessors have always intended—should be fulfilled by the Navy of this country. The business of the Navy is to find the enemy's ships wherever they are and destroy them; and to talk as if we or any one else had suggested or implied that the battleships of England were to be tied up in the Channel, like punts in the River Thames, for the purposes of home defence, is to impute to us a heresy which certainly never possessed our minds. But I would venture to suggest this, that, if it is indeed the business of our Navy to damage the enemy at sea, there would probably be no more effectual mode of damaging him than by attacking the kind of flotilla of transports which is supposed in this case, and which would have to cross the Channel under circumstances of very great difficulty and in a very helpless condition.

I may, perhaps, notice at this point one or two of the special criticisms which have been made upon the statement of the case by the Prime Minister. It has been suggested that the task of the invader would not be attended by so many difficulties as the Prime Minister suggested. We are told that he considerably over-estimated the amount of tonnage which would be necessary for an invasion across the Channel; we are told that he contemplated a hostile concentration at only one port, but that such a concentration might take place at more ports than one. Or, again, it is suggested that a hostile landing might take place simultaneously at several points; and another criticism is that we have not sufficiently taken into account the fact that the invading flotilla would probably be accompanied by a covering naval force of some kind. As to all these criticisms let me, in the first place, say that the problem as stated by the Prime Minister was not intended to convey an exhaustive statement of every possible hostile combination which might be made against these shores. For example, take the case of the tonnage which would be necessary for such an invasion. The estimate taken by the Defence Committee was the best estimate which we could obtain from our expert advisers; but supposing, for the sake of argument, that you have to take away 50,000 tons from the tonnage estimated by Mr. Balfour, does that really essentially alter the conditions of the problem? Again, supposing, for the sake of argument, that the concentration has taken place at several ports instead of one; would it not be the case that if such a concentration were going on at several ports we should hear something about it? The whole of Mr. Balfour's hypothesis was based on the assumption that the attack was to be delivered suddenly and secretly. If there were to be a general concentration, if, for example, a whole fleet of liners were taken off from the usual routes, of course the thing would get out, and we should take very good care that our main fleet was not far off when the time came.

Then there is the question of the covering force. We naturally assumed that an invading flotilla would be accompanied by a covering force of some kind; but we are confident that the attacking force which we should be able to produce, even during the absence, remember, of our main fleets, would be amply sufficient to deal with the enemy's covering force as well as with the flotilla which it escorted. In a case of that kind there would be an enormous advantage on the side of those who were attacking the flotilla as against those who were defending it, because it is almost inconceivable, even if the two naval forces were evenly matched, that some ships of the assailant force would not be able to break through the line and deal havoc among the herd of boats and vessels which are supposed to be conveying the force across the Channel.

Then my noble friend Lord Goschen told you that the Prime Minister had not dealt at sufficient length with the question of raids. It is quite true that the passage in which raids were referred to was not very long; but let me say that, if the Prime Minister had attempted to deal with the whole of the conceivable incidents connected with the attack upon, and defence of these islands, no speech ever delivered in the House of Commons would have contained all he might have said on the subject. I am able to tell the noble Viscount, however, that the question of raids has certainly not been left out of consideration. But when he suggests that, just as we have published statements of our views with regard to an attack upon a large scale, so we might give to the public information as to the manner in which raids would be dealt with, then I am tempted to say that at that point we arrive at a stage where greater reticence is essential; because you could not publish a disquisition upon the possibility of raids on different parts of the British coast without indicating pretty clearly what the raidable points were, and thereby giving information which it is not desirable to disclose.

My Lords, if I may sum up in the fewest possible words our view of the case I would say this: The problem is a composite one, concerning both the military and the naval defence of these islands. We put the question of naval defence first, because in our view if we were to lose our supremacy at sea we should find ourselves face to face with the vastly superior military resources of Continental nations, and we should find that the sea, instead of being a barrier against attack, had become a bridge over which the attack could be delivered. In that event, which I should be sorry to contemplate, I doubt whether a Volunteer army would suffice for our needs, and I feel convinced that the growth of our military Estimates would be of a kind which would appal even the most extravagant advocate of Army expenditure. We believe that in putting naval defence first we are taking the view that the history of the world and of this country supports.

Lord Wemyss at the outset of his speech quoted extracts from a German novel, but I thought I heard him say that the novelist admitted that for 900 years the British Islands had been immune from invasion. For home defence we regard the land forces of this country as auxiliary to the naval forces, but we do not for that reason for a moment suggest that the importance of a land force should not be sufficiently recognised. We feel it is necessary not only that we should have a strong Army for the purposes of offence abroad, but that the rest of our forces should be adequately organised for defence at home. That is the object which the present Secretary of State for War has in view.

Some complaint has been made that we have achieved so little during the last few years. Well, I can say in the first place that we have achieved something. We have, in deference to a general demand, reorganised the central machine by which the affairs of the Army are administered. When we are told that, in the case of the Auxiliary Forces, we have not accomplished as much as some noble Lords would like, let us, at any rate, remember how immensely difficult is the task of those reformers who wish to make fundamental changes in the intricate constitution of the British Army. It is, at any rate, within our recollection that last year the present War Office desired to deal with the Militia forces, but they were stopped from doing so, and the original scheme had to be taken back and reviewed. Within the last few days again a suggestion has been made that some information should be collected as to the efficiency of the Volunteers. The immediate result of the appearance of these questions in the public Press has been to raise a general alarm and to produce interrogations in this and the other House of Parliament. I merely mention these things to show how difficult it is in a short space of time to deal in the thoroughgoing fashion which some noble Lords advocate with these military questions.

My Lords, it only remains for me to say that, after very carefully considering the terms of the noble Earl's Motion, we find in it, if it is reasonably interpreted—and I am sure that the noble Lord does not desire to place any strained interpretation on his words—nothing to which we can really take exception; and, therefore, we gladly avail ourselves of his suggestion that this question should be dealt with without any attempt to bring Party considerations to bear upon it; we shall, therefore, when he puts his motion to the House, certainly not vote against it.

*The Marquess of RIPON: My Lords, the result at which my noble friend appears to have arrived is rather a startling one, because he has been converted by the noble Lord near me and is going to accept his Motion. But I think the House must be somewhat disappointed that my noble friend has made no allusion to the very grave and startling statement made by my noble and gallant friend on the Cross Benches. I understood my noble and gallant friend to say that our Army at the present moment was not in any better state of preparation than it was at the commencement of the South African War. Coming from such an authority as Lord Roberts that is a statement so grave and serious that I think it ought to have been taken notice of by my noble friend, and that the House and the country ought to have received some explanation or statement of the views of the Government in regard to it. My noble friend appears either not to have heard that statement of Lord Roberts or to have thought it inadvisable to reply to it, but I hope that some words calculated to inspire more confidence in the public than they can feel after what has fallen from Lord Roberts with be forthcoming from some member of the Government before this debate closes

I was very much struck in the speech of the Foreign Secretary to observe the different aspect in which he placed the questions raised in the speech of Mr. Balfour from that which they presented to the public when that speech was first delivered. I thought the "blue-water" scheme had rather retired into the distance; we heard a good deal more about the military defence of this country against the danger of invasion than we had heard on any previous occasion. My noble friend quoted certain expressions of Mr.

Balfour's. He said that Mr. Balfour had stated—

> "Assume the Volunteers; assume the Militia; assume a special Regular force for the defence of the country."

Well, my Lords, if the Government are relying not only upon the Navy, but also upon a force of that description to be retained in the country for our home defence, we are entitled to ask: What is the present condition of the Militia; what is the present condition of the Volunteers; and what becomes of the territorial army for home defence? We had a discussion on the Militia the other night, in the course of which my noble friend opposite said—if I understood him rightly—that some battalions of the Militia were to be reduced and some were to be amalgamated. But, my Lords, you can do nothing with the Militia until you tell them how you are going to treat them. My noble friend says we must not press the Secretary of State for War. Well, we cannot wait indefinitely to have this question settled, particularly when we are told on the authority of Lord Roberts what the present condition of the Army is. These are questions which will not wait until Mr. Arnold-Forster is able to come to a decision in respect to them. They are questions of vital importance to the country, in regard to which, before this session closes, we ought to have some clear explanation of what is the policy of the Government.

Then my noble friend spoke of the Volunteers, and he complained of the criticisms which had been directed to a recent Paper issued by the Secretary of State for War, and which has just been laid on the Table of this House. My Lords, it was not the fact that the Secretary of State for War made inquiries in respect to the present condition of the Volunteers which startled people in regard to that circular; it was the fact that the Secretary of State asked to be informed as to what number of Volunteers were fit for foreign service. The question is, what do you mean? You have made the Militia a part of the Regular Army Reserve.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: Not yet.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: My noble friend is more hopeful than I am.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: The Bill has not passed its Second Reading yet.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: And you are now asking questions about the Volunteers as if, instead of their being intended for home defence, your first view was that they were a force from which you could draw recruits for the Regular Army. In the late war many Volunteers went out, and I believe did excellent service. But accepting Volunteers who may be willing in the course of a war to go out on active service, and making it in any respect the declared intention of the Government that they should be employed for the purpose of service out of the country are very different things. The Volunteers—and, according to my old-fashioned notions, the Militia, too—are engaged for service at home. You admit that you must have a competent military force in the country, at all events, to resist possible raids, and yet, as far as we know, you have wasted the session in regard to the organisation of both these forces.

Then, my Lords, there is what is called the territorial army, or the short-service army, which was to be specially for home defence. Does it exist? Of course, I know it does not.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: It was never suggested that the short-service army, or what the noble Marquess calls the home-service army, was to be for home defence; it was to go abroad in time of war.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: Of course the noble Earl knows better than I do, but surely it was stated that the force which was being recruited for a two years service was meant for home defence?

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: No.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: Then what is the home defence? I may be quite wrong, but I have certainly always understood, and all those with whom I have discussed this question have always understood, that that short-service army was meant for home defence, and that it was thought desirable to have a long-service army, with a nine years enlistment, to go abroad, leaving here the two years service army for home defence. However, if I am wrong in that, so much the worse. What is your army for home defence? You are recruiting now nothing but a long-service army to go abroad; where, then, is this force to which my noble friend alluded intended for home defence? We ought to have some clear and definite statement of what are the intentions of the Government with respect to the defence of these islands—I will not say the defence of these islands against a great invasion; I will, for the purpose of this discussion, accept the blue-water theory as far as it goes, but it is admitted now by His Majesty's Government that raids of considerable importance are possible, and what we ought to know before Parliament separates is this: What have you done and what are you doing to provide immediately against a danger of that kind?

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, I should like to say a few words to take stock, as it were, of the situation. If this discussion had done nothing more than procure for us that admirable statement from Lord Roberts it would have been well worth while making the Motion and having the discussion. Nothing could be more unsatisfactory than that statement as to the state of the Army, and, to confirm it as regards the home force, here is what the Norfolk Commission Report says—

> "The result of our protracted inquiries is this, that Your Majesty's Militia and Volunteer forces have not at present either the strength or the military efficiency to enable them to fulfil the functions for which they exist."

That is a most unsatisfactory state as regards the Volunteers and the Militia. My noble friend Lord Lansdowne seemed rather sore that what they intended to do with the Militia was stopped last year. Now what was it the present Secretary of State for War tried to do with the Militia? He tried to do away with it altogether as a Militia. It was to be absorbed. I put the Question, "Do you mean the whole of it?" and my noble friend Lord Donoughmore said, "Yes, we do mean that the whole of the Militia should be absorbed in the Regular Army." That is doing away with the constitutional force of the Militia, which was originally raised absolutely for home defence, with power to volunteer for, foreign service. Being defeated in that what does the Secretary of State next propose? Why, to alter it indirectly in this way: he brings in a Bill called the Militia Service Bill. That Bill passed this House through the support of Militia colonels, but happily it has not yet passed the House of Commons; it has not yet passed its Second Reading, and I do not think it ever will. In that case my noble friend will have further cause of complaint as to the Secretary of State's salutary measures for Army reform by getting rid of the Militia or altering its character being stopped.

What are the alterations that this Bill proposes to make in the character of the Militia? The Militia is the constitutional force for home defence, but it has the power of volunteering for foreign service with the Regular Army, and it has done so on many occasions to the great benefit of the nation. But under this Bill, instead of being enlisted for home defence, with power to volunteer for foreign service, all fresh members of the Militia will be liable to be sent on foreign service. Of course, existing members will be on the old footing. But the difference is this: under the original constitution you invite them, "Dilly, dilly, come and be killed"; whereas under this Bill you will say "Dilly, dilly, go and be killed." That is a great constitutional change which I hope will not pass the House of Commons. I trust that that Assembly will stand by the old Militia, thereby forcing the Government to find some other means of improving our home defences.

My Lords, for my part I am thoroughly satisfied with the result of the debate on this Motion. What have we got? My noble friend seemed to think that all I said about the blue-water school was directed against the Government. It was directed against the school—Sir J. Colomb and others, the "Colombines" as we call them. By the acceptance of this Motion we have at any rate got the assurance that the view of that school is not the view of the

Government. That is a great step. The Motion says—

> "that . . . it would be a danger to the Realm, and limit the power of the Navy as an offensive force in war, to trust to it alone for home defence."

That is a great step gained. Then another step we have gained is this—the agreement that we should at all times have our home land defence in such a state that no nation would ever attempt either a serious invasion or a raid. My noble friend discussed the position that the ships were to occupy under the speech of the Prime Minister. But what we want is that the ships should be perfectly free, and that they should not be required to be in the Channel to watch against invasion, because we should be in that state that no nation would ever attempt an invasion of our shores, either serious or otherwise.

I would end by saying this. In the remarks which I made to your Lordships in support of this Motion I urged that this question was one of such vital importance to this nation that the two sides of the House—the leaders of the two sides—should meet and settle between them what should be done, and, that having been done, neither should endeavour to make political capital out of it. It should be treated as the most vital question in the world, as it concerns the safety not only of our hearths and homes, but the safety of the Empire as a whole. That, my Lords, is what I think should follow on the acceptance of this Motion which I have had the honour of bringing forward, and which I am thankful the Government have accepted.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

FLOATING MINES.

LORD MUSKERRY rose "To call attention to the grave risks to life and property presented by the great number of floating mines in the China Seas outside territorial waters, and to casualties caused by such mines; to ask whether the Merchant Service Guild, as representing the captains and officers of British ships trading in the China Seas, has appealed to the Admiralty to co-operate in the destruction of these mines; and to ask whether the Admiralty cannot depute those of His Majesty's ships on the China Station which are available, to undertake the work of removing, as far as possible, the serious dangers to British ships which now exist in that quarter of the globe."

He said: My Lords, having been made acquainted with the facts, and the indignation felt by British subjects in the Far East over the laxity of the Admiralty in this matter of floating mines, I am impelled to call your Lordships' attention to the necessity of some active steps being taken to meet the situation and to prevent that terrible sacrifice of life which might occur at any moment. Being so far away, we are liable, perhaps, to minimise the risks and to imagine that a stray floating mine or two cannot be helped at a time like this and that there is no cause for commotion. But my information comes direct from people on the spot, and the Merchant Service Guild have placed in my hands papers which disclose a really very alarming state of affairs. They come principally from those who are commanding and officering the many British ships constantly trading in the China Seas. I am assured, for instance, that the Gulf of Pe-chi-li is full of floating mines, and, at certain places, vessels must, at night-time, come to a dead stop until daylight. Then, on starting, the look-outs are doubled with the captain and an officer on the bridge. Passing steamers are constantly reporting the mines. I have a letter from the captain of a steamer travelling in Chinese waters in which he says—

> "The latest reports show that mines have now drifted south of Shanghai in the track of the mail steamers from Hong-Kong; two fishing junks were blown up last week and most of their crews killed. The feeling here is that if a mail-boat is blown up, it may appeal to the Government and cause something to be done towards getting rid of these dangers. As long as it is only coasters it doesn't matter. There were fifty-seven steamers here (New-chwang) just before the port closed last December, and about fifty here just after it opened, as well as Japanese transports, and probably quite as many running to Taku Bar for Tientsin, all of which have to come through this dangerous zone. The principal companies do not run at night and so minimise the risk, at, of course, a great expense in the way of time. No less than seven mines were reported in Chefoo two days ago, all seen in a few hours."

I might state for the information of your Lordships that a British steamer, the "Kashing," had a hole blown in her bows by a floating mine and it was only a mere chance that the lives of all on board were saved. The question is, what is this country doing in the matter? So far as I understand, the Admiralty have done nothing beyond issuing warning notices to mariners. But these notices are almost superfluous, for the news soon spreads when it is a matter of life and death. We may rest quite content that navigators will exercise all the caution in their power, but as floating mines are not in the habit of giving a warning signal no amount of care can avoid risk of disaster.

To voice some of the opinions expressed in Eastern circles the *North China Daily News* says in the course of an article—

"Would it not be advisable, while the Gulf continues to be infested with these dangers to navigation, to station a small gun-boat here—in addition to the usual guardship—for the express purpose of searching out and destroying mines reported by passing ships? By so doing, our naval authorities would, I feel sure, confer a great boon on shippers and shipping engaged in the coasting trade, and also to the travelling public. The question becomes specially urgent and important when it is noted that the greater proportion of the northern trade is done in British bottoms."

Then, again, in a leading article headed "The Dangers of Mines" the same paper says—

"It seems to us impossible, for instance, that British steamers should be running up and down the coast between the Yangtze and the Peiho, in hourly danger of being blown up by Russian mines with all on board, and that little or no effort should be made by the British Navy to clear away these dangers. The danger of mines has not been exaggerated, rather it has been the endeavour of everyone concerned to minimise the danger, for obvious reasons. No one wishes to unduly alarm passengers, and shippers, and insurers. Last year we were told that the anxious look-out men were mistaking empty barrels and bully-beef tins and fishermen's buoys for mines; but this year there has been no possibility of pretending that the sea between the Miatou Islands, and a point some distance south of the South-East Promontory, is not strewn with these dangers. Many junks and fishing boats have fallen victims to them."

A NOBLE LORD: May I ask whether the noble Lord is in order in reading from a daily newspaper?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): Only by permission of the House.

LORD MUSKERRY: Very well; I will pass over that, but this leading article sets out the matter very clearly, These remarks are intended to show what our fellow-subjects in the Far East think of the matter, and I should add that it was also referred to the British Minister at Peking by the Shanghai Chamber of Commerce and the leading steamship owners in China. As a contrast to the apathy of the Admiralty I am given to understand that even the Chinese have given orders for one of their cruisers to assist in destroying the mines.

There is no question of infringing on territorial rights, for these mines are now floating broadcast on the high seas. Why some of our men-of-war out there are not directed to sweep the seas for these mines I really cannot understand. Their time would then be spent in a service to humanity, and as their business is to police the seas, it seems to me that they are sadly neglecting that duty. I should like to hear from my noble friend who is answering for the First Lord of the Admiralty precisely what the reasons are for the inaction of His Majesty's Government in this most serious matter. And I do indeed hope to learn that it is now the intention of the Admiralty to assist in a practical way in ridding the China Seas of dangers which give rise to possibilities almost too awful to think of.

Of course I cannot say what all the reply of my noble friend will be, but I think I can forecast a portion of it. There is a letter from the Admiralty to the Merchant Service Guild, from which I will read only some extracts—

"The destruction of these mines in the waters of the Laio-tung Peninsula has been systematically undertaken by the Japanese and . . . the commanding officer has reported several cases in which mines have been destroyed by His Majesty's ships. This will be done whenever possible, but my Lords cannot undertake to detail His Majesty's ships for this dangerous duty . . ."

But these mines have got beyond territorial waters, and it is a poor thing for British ships to be trusting to foreign navies to protect them from these dangers when we have our own Navy on the spot.

I have also received a letter, which I will not read to your Lordships, from the captain of a vessel out there showing the number of mines that were met and the number destroyed. Then the last thing was a report from the officer commanding H.M.S. "Hogue," published in *Lloyd's Register* of July 3rd. I do not know whether my noble friend is going to read that report?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (The Marquess of LINLITHGOW): No, I am not.

LORD MUSKERRY: I have a letter received since then, one paragraph of which says—

> "No less than three steamers have struck mines since that gentleman (the commanding officer of H.M.S. Hogue) said most of the mines reported were empty tubs, etc. Two of the steamers were sunk and one was beached and repaired. The Chinese Government have now offered a small gun and an officer or gunner to any ship bound up the Gulf of Pe-chi-li who cares to apply for one."

I will not read further; I will only say that it is not a nice thing that for the first time in our history the British merchant service should have to look to foreign navies for the assistance which they ought to get from their own. My Lords, I beg to put the Question of which I have given notice.

THE MARQUESS OF LINLITHGOW: In answer to the noble Lord I have to state that the question of the risk to life and property through floating mines in the China Seas outside territorial waters has for some time past been occupying the attention of the Admiralty. A notice to mariners indicating the danger zone has been promulgated, and instructions have been issued to His Majesty's ships on the station to destroy any mines they may meet with on the high seas. The clearance of floating mines from territorial waters has been taken in hand by the Chinese and Japanese Governments. It is a fact that the Merchant Service Guild called the attention of the Admiralty to reports from certain captains trading in those waters representing the danger to navigation from this source, and asked that His Majesty's ships might take steps to clear away the mines; but the orders given on the subject were not the result of this appeal, but of a previous communication from the Japanese Government inviting the co-operation of His Majesty's ships on the high seas.

DOCKYARD DISCHARGES.

THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER rose "To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty—(1) As to the system upon which the dockyard men are being discharged from the Portsmouth Dockyards; and (2) whether it is true that the 'St. Vincent' training ship in Portsmouth harbour is to be given up." He said: At this hour of the evening I shall say only a very few words in asking these Questions of which I have given notice, and I would apologise for having given notice to the First Lord of the Admiralty at a time when he was ill. I was quite unaware of his illness, or I would have refrained from putting the Questions. I venture to bring to your Lordships' notice the position of those who are now being discharged from employment in His Majesty's dockyards. This question was brought up two or three months ago, I believe, in the other House, and on June 7th Mr. Pretyman gave an Answer in which he stated that there were about 1,000 of these employees to be discharged from Portsmouth. We are now told that there are to be over 2,000 discharged at Portsmouth, while proportionate numbers will have to be discharged from Chatham and Devonport. Very naturally the result is a state of intense depression and a sense of grievance, more especially when those discharges are apparently conducted in a strangely capricious manner. I say "capricious manner," because the workmen seem quite unable to discover from the way in which the discharges are conducted whether any sort of account is taken of length of service, goodness of character, or skill and ability.

I will not weary your Lordships, but I must give one or two instances. There is the case of a smith, aged thirty-seven, who has been in the Government service in the dockyards some eighteen years. He recently received notice to quit, and the very same week he received notice that his wages had been raised by two shillings a week. Complaint was brought before the authorities on behalf of this most deserving man whose character was quite superlatively excellent, and the authorities made reply that it was indeed a very hard case, but that there were numerous cases of the same kind and no exception could be made. Three days ago another instance was brought to public notice in one of the evening papers in Portsmouth—the case of a man who had been twenty-five years in the dockyard, who had worked hard and who had borne a good character the whole time. He asked the reason why he was discharged, and he was told that fifteen years ago he had been seen smoking in the dockyard.

My Lords, I have selected only two out of a very large number of instances which I have in my hand, and which I desire to bring before your Lordships' notice for the purpose of indicating that too little discrimination and consideration is being shown in the dismissal of men who have been engaged for the better part of their lifetime in His Majesty's service in the dockyard; men bearing the very best characters, and who have shown by their energy and workmanlike ability that they deserve well of the nation. These are the men who are being dismissed, and who, in consequence, will be thrown out of employment and become a portion of the large number of unemployed in the country, at the very time that the nation is selling off a lot of old ships that are being bought up, I believe, by foreign nations, to be broken up by foreign labourers. I should have thought that it would have been possible at least to have retained those old ships, so that our men might be given labour and work rather than that they should be cast upon the rates of our great seaport towns. I very much hope that a reply will be forthcoming which will show that there is perhaps more system and more discrimination being exercised in the melancholy work of discharging some of our best workmen than appears to be the case at first sight.

Then, my Lords, the other Question refers to the remoured abandonment of the training ship "St. Vincent." The "St. Vincent" is a training ship with several hundred lads on board in Portsmouth Harbour. The lads—I have seen them myself—are well trained, well taught, well exercised, and they are in the enjoyment of excellent health, like the lads on board the "Impregnable" and the "Lion" at Devonport. I am told that the "St. Vincent" is about to be abandoned and the lads transferred to an institution at Harwich—that is, that the nation will have all the lads who are being prepared for the Navy collected in one great institution at Harwich. We are told that it is for the sake of their health and morals. I am not sure whether for the sake of their health it will be a good thing to have all lads who are being prepared for the Navy in one great institution. It is far better to be exposed to epidemics in different centres than for all the lads to be exposed to epidemics in one great centre. So far as morals and discipline are concerned the same thing applies. If you taint a great institution containing 2,000 or 3,000 boys, greater harm will be done than if you try to exercise control in different local centres containing 700, 800, or 900 lads. At the same time at the small local centres there is a better chance of personal control and supervision. I very much trust that the suggested policy has not been finally decided upon, especially in a place like Portsmouth, which is one of the finest recruiting grounds that our country possesses for the Navy, where any lad who is being brought up for the Navy witnesses every day that which will inspire in him enthusiasm and hope for his future career.

THE MARQUESS OF LINLITHGOW: My Lords, if the right rev. Prelate will kindly inform me afterwards of any individual cases of hardship or unfairness which may have been brought before him, I am commissioned to say that they shall have the careful consideration of the Admiralty. With reference to the first part of the Question I am desired to say that the discharges now being carried out at Portsmouth and other naval yards are necessitated by the reduction in the amount of work, principally repair work, required to be done on His Majesty's ships. This reduction is due to several causes, the chief of which are (1) the removal from the list of the Navy of a great number of ships which otherwise would have needed extensive repairs to maintain them in a state of efficiency; (2) the manning of the ships in reserve by nucleus crews, who themselves perform the ordinary work of keeping the ships ready for immediate service and carry out considerable repairs. Under the previous system a great deal of dockyard work was necessary on the ships before they could be regarded as ready for war. (3) The amount of work done in the last two or three years has been greatly in excess of the normal, partly owing to the large repairs to machinery and boilers necessitated by the difficulties which attended the first introduction of water-tube boilers. I may further say that an important Committee on Naval Establishments has been at work during most of this year, and has investigated the whole question of dockyard work. The Report of this Committee has not yet been received, but it will necessarily affect very greatly the problem of the work to be done in future in the Royal yards, and it is impossible to say before the Report has been considered by the Board of Admiralty whether any further large discharges will be necessary, or to give any limit of time for their completion. I may add that the Admiralty have the fullest sympathy with the individual cases where hardship has occurred. The general rule is, subject to the discretion of the admiral-superintendents of the yards, that those men who have the longer service have their services retained as long as is found possible, but due regard must also be had to the necessity of adjusting numbers between trades to meet the requirements of the service. It must also be remembered that the Admiralty, while it cannot give permanent work, gives constant employment—that is, constant while the employment lasts. With regard to the second Question, on the completion of the new training establishment at Shotley, boys will be transferred there from certain training ships, and among these the "St. Vincent," but no definite orders have been given on the subject up to the present.

WAR STORES (COMMISSION) BILL.

On the Order to go into Committee on this Bill.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): Since this matter was last before the House I have looked into the question raised by the noble Marquess, and I adhere to the view I then took that there is power under the Bill to compel the attendance of witnesses and to insist on the production of documents. This power arises from a statute passed for the express purpose of giving a Commission power to compel the attendance of witnesses both in foreign countries and in the British Colonies, and that statute will apply. I feel satisfied I am right in that view, and I will only say that I think it would be a very serious thing to proceed over the head, as it were, of a self-governing colony and to interfere with the administration of justice in that colony without first informing them. Even if I were wrong in my view I do not think it would be desirable to put an express power in the Bill. It has been suggested that difficulty and delay might arise through the colonial Legislature not being in session. Even if that were so, I think the delay would be far less an evil than an attempt to do what might create dissatisfaction in the Colonies. I gather that the noble Marquess will not persist in his objection to proceeding with the Bill?

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: On the legal question, of course, I accept the opinion of the learned Lord on the Woolsack. I wish, however, to say that I did not propose that the authority of the local Legislatures should be overruled by this Act. All I did was to ask what would be the course required to be taken if a Sub-Commission went out to South Africa.

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Bill read 3^a, and passed.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 10*th July*, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. **Speaker** laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [Lords]; Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. **Speaker** laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

Hitchin and District Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Hessle Gas Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [Lords]; Tees Valley Water Board Bill [Lords]; Whitby Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Thames Conservancy Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

PURSHAD, THAKUR.

Petition of Thakur Purshad, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

DEER FORESTS (HIGHLAND CROFTING COUNTIES).

Return [presented 29th June]; to be printed. [No. 232.]

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Copy presented, of Memorandum by the President of the Local Government Board [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IMPERIAL REVENUE (COLLECTION AND EXPENDITURE) (GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 8th March; *Mr. Joseph A.*

Pease]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 233.]

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).

Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment (No. 4) Regulations, 1905, dated 29th June, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK (REGULATIONS).

Copy presented, of Post Office Savings Bank Regulations, 1905, dated 15th May, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Report on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, K.G., preserved at Belvoir Castle, Vol. IV. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations for the Instruction and Training of Pupil Teachers from August 1st, 1905, to July 31st, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary for Scotland of a Departmental Committee on the Sea Fisheries of Sutherland and Caithness. Vol. II. Minutes of Evidence and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the appointment of a Visiting Committee to the Prison at Glasgow (Duke Street) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS.

Copy presented, of Report of Proceedings by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, under the Diseases of Animals Acts, for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.

Account presented, of Deposits in Naval Savings Banks, and the payments thereof, and the interest thereon, etc., during the financial year 1903-4 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 234.]

REVENUE BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum explanatory of the Revenue Bill."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 235.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Convict Labour in Cape Colony.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a system exists of hiring out for various terms of servitude persons convicted of offences in Cape Colony to the De Beers Diamond Company at the rate of 2d. per diem; and, if so, by what authority and under what regulations does the system exist, and does the Colonial Office accept any responsibility in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The Ministers of the Cape Colony have stated that convict labour is hired out to various public bodies and private employers in the Cape Colony, and that, in accordance with this practice, an agreement was entered into in 1889 between the Government and the De Beers Consolidated Mines, Limited, for the establishment of a convict station on the company's premises at Kimberley, and for the supply of native convicts for employment in the diamond mines. The company pays the entire cost of the buildings and staff, and provides for the clothing, rationing, and medical attendance of the convicts; and in addition to this pays the Government a small sum per man for the convicts supplied. The system has legislative sanction under Section 52 of the Colonial Act, No. 23, of 1888. The matter is one entirely within the control of the responsible Government and Legislature of the Cape Colony.

Expenditure and Financial Position of Municipal Corporations.

MR. MARSHALL HALL (Lancashire, Southport): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will consider the advisability of instituting an inquiry, by Committee or otherwise, into the expenditure and financial position of the municipal corporations in this country, with a view to obtain a Report thereon.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The subject of local expenditure and local indebtedness is undoubtedly one of the utmost importance, but I doubt whether any such inquiry as my hon. and learned friend has in mind could at the present moment be started with advantage.

Report of Vagrancy Committee.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Committee now dealing with the question of vagrancy will report during the present session.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I understand that there still remains a considerable number of witnesses to be examined, and that it will not be possible for the Committee to make their Report during the present session.

Orange Disturbances in Glasgow.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): To ask the Lord-Advocate whether his attention has been called to disturbances of a Party character which occurred in the Partick district of Glasgow on July 1st, due to an Orange band parading the district playing Party tunes; whether he is aware that the shopkeepers in the vicinity were compelled to close their premises, and that two young girls had to be removed to the hospital suffering from serious injuries; and will he say whether any of the bandsmen were arrested, and, if not, why this step was not taken; and whether, in view of the proposal to hold Orange demonstrations in Glasgow on July 12th, precautions will be taken to protect the lives and property of Catholics in those districts through which the demonstrators will pass.

(*Answered by Mr. Scott Dickson.*) My attention has been called to the disturbances referred to. I am informed that one shop door was closed for a few minutes, and one girl suffering from a scalp wound was taken to the infirmary where the wound was dressed; the girl was then sent home. The bandsmen were not in uniform and none were arrested, as they broke up and mixed with the crowd. The local authorities are fully aware of the circumstances, and I have no doubt that all proper precautions will be taken by them.

Loss of Public Holidays by Excise Officials at Distilleries.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that in several distilleries working all the year round throughout the United Kingdom Excise officers are required to perform duty on recognised official holidays, even Christmas Day not being excepted, while other Government officials enjoy the privilege of these holidays; and whether, seeing that the Excise officers in such places have frequently to give attendance at irregular hours, as well as performing night duty in unhealthy surroundings from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m., and in view of the difficulties of these Civil servants which are not experienced in other branches of the public service, the Treasury will consider the claims of these officials to special leave in lieu of service given by them on official holidays.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I understand the advantages enjoyed by Excise officers holding the appointments referred to by the hon. Member counterbalance the loss of certain public holidays.

The Crimes Act—Proclaimed Districts in Ireland.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the several counties and districts in Ireland which are at the present time proclaimed under Sections 3 or 4, or both, of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, together with the date of such proclamation and the names of the Privy Councillors who signed the same.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) Each of the counties and county boroughs set forth in the following list is proclaimed under both Sections 3 and 4 of The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887 :—

County.	Proclaimed District.	Date of Proclamations.
Cavan - - - - -	The County	16th April, 1902
Clare - - - - -	do.	do.
Cork - - - - -	do.	do.
Cork County Borough - -	The County Borough	do.
Dublin County Borough - -	do.	1st September, 1902
Galway - - - - -	The County	do.
King's County - - - -	do.	do.
Leitrim - - - - -	do.	16th April, 1902
Limerick - - - - -	do.	1st September, 1902
Limerick County Borough -	The County Borough	do.
Longford - - - - -	The County	do.
Mayo - - - - -	do.	16th April, 1902
Queen's County - - -	do.	1st September, 1902
Roscommon - - - -	do.	16th April, 1902
Sligo - - - - -	do.	do.
Tipperary - - - -	do.	do.
Waterford - - - -	do.	do.
Waterford County Borough -	The County Borough	do.
Westmeath - - - -	The County	1st September, 1902

The proclamations of April 16th, 1902, were signed by the Lord-Lieutenant (Earl Cadogan), and the following Privy Councillors—The Lord Chancellor, Viscount Powerscourt, Lord Clonbrock, and Mr. A. H. Smith-Barry. The proclamations of September 1st, 1902, were signed by the Lords Justices (the Lord Chancellor and Viscount Powerscourt), and the following Privy Councillors—The Chief Secretary (Mr. Wyndham), and the Attorney-General (Mr. Atkinson).

Aliens Bill—Danger to British Shipping Trade.

MR. CHARLES WILSON (Hull, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the

Home Department whether, under his Amendments to the Aliens Bill, he will provide against the possibility of Scandinavian and Russian transmigrants being placed under disabilities which will endanger the trade being diverted to the competing Scandinavian and German lines, seeing that the British shipping companies will have to incur more expense and delays than at present.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I think that the hon. Member will find that his point is satisfactorily met by the proposed Amendment to Clause 8, page 6, line 20 of the Bill, which stands on the Paper in my name. This Amendment is designed, and is believed, to enable the shipping companies concerned to relieve themselves, under due security, of all unnecessary restrictions upon *bona fide* transmigrant traffic.

Local Practitioners attending Patients in Isolation Hospitals.

SIR CHARLES WELBY (Nottinghamshire, Newark): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that, in the case of an isolation hospital having no resident medical officer, it is customary for the local practitioners to attend their own patients; and whether, in the event of any such practitioner being a member of the local authority to which such hospital belongs, it is the practice of the Local Government Board to take any steps to prevent the recovery by him of the usual fees paid by the local authority in such case.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I believe that not infrequently patients in isolation hospitals are attended by their own medical men. I am not aware of any case in which the Local Government Board have taken steps to prevent the recovery of fees in such circumstances, but I think it right to draw attention to the provision in Section 12 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, which disqualifies a person for being a councillor of a borough if he has directly or indirectly by himself, or his partner, any share or interest in any contract or employment with, by, or on behalf of the council. There is a similar provision in the Local Government Act, 1894, as regards members of urban or rural district councils.

Surrey Education Committee's Accounts.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the last report of the Local Government Board auditor on the accounts of the Surrey Education Committee stated that sums amounting to over £5,900 had been illegally charged on the rates, making the rates liable to be quashed on objection; that considerable sums had been paid to managers for wear and tear and not refunded, although the education committee had decided that no such sums should be paid for the year under audit; that lump sums from the county funds had been placed at the disposal of managers of non-provided schools without requiring accounts of these moneys to be audited; and, if so, what action has been taken, and what guarantees have been given, against the recurrence of such irregularities.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The auditor's report contained statements which were substantially to the effect indicated in the Question. I have received a copy of the reply of the education committee to that report, from which it would appear that the sums, amounting to over £5,900, referred to were raised by rates in certain special areas without account being taken of the net balances of the previous school authorities for those areas. The committee say that it was impossible to ascertain these balances at the time when the estimates for the rates had to be made, and that under the circumstances they were justified in making arrangements which would allow of the necessary adjustments being carried out at a later date. I understand that the auditor was assured that the sums for wear and tear would be dealt with in adjusting future accounts between the Committee and the managers. With respect to the sums advanced by the Education Committee to the managers, the auditor reports that arrangements were ultimately made for examining and checking the managers' cash books, although this was imperfectly done. As I stated in reply to a previous Question by the hon. Member on the subject, the education committee have drawn up some detailed instructions with a view of securing that in future the financial transactions and accounts of the managers shall be properly controlled and supervised.

Upholstery Work in Government Dockyards.

MR. BENN (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the upholstery work allocated to women in the Devonport Dockyard extends to the stuffing of chairs from the bare frames, work hitherto confined in the furnishing trade to men; whether the advertisement issued from Chatham asking for women to upholster chairs and couches is intended to cover this work; and, if so, whether he will take steps to confine the work of the women upholstresses in the dockyards to those lighter branches of the craft in which they usually find employment.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The upholstery work allocated to women in Devonport Dockyard does not include the stuffing of chairs from the bare frames, but is confined to sewing work, such as making curtains, window blinds, mattress ticks, pillow covers, overcases for furniture, etc. Women have not been employed on any stuffing, and the only work done by them in this connection, after making the cases, has been to sew up the last of the chair covers, mattresses, etc., after the stuffing has been completed by men. The advertisement issued from Chatham, asking for women to upholster chairs and couches, was intended to cover this work, but qualified candidates were not obtainable. It is intended to confine the work of the upholstresses in the dockyards to the lighter branches of the craft in which they usually find employment, in accordance with existing practice at Devonport.

Vaccination Prosecutions at Dundee.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the Lord-Advocate whether the prosecution in Dundee of twenty-one parents who conscientiously object to the vaccination of their children has been ordered by the Local Government Board for Scotland; whether such prosecutions take place in England; and why so many prosecutions of this kind are being conducted in one Scottish city.

(*Answered by Mr. Scott Dickson.*) The Local Government Board do not directly order the prosecution of vaccination defaulters, but are required by the Vaccination Act to see that its provisions are duly carried out. The Board communicate when necessary with parish councils calling attention to the provisions of the Act, and, among the parish councils lately so communicated with, the parish council of Dundee was written to in the early part of the year. In regard to the latter part of the hon. Member's Question I have no information in regard to English prosecutions. The number of prosecutions, of course, depends on the number of defaulters.

Regulations for Pupil-Teachers.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, in view of the altered arrangements for the education of pupil-teachers drawn up by the Board of Education, it is now possible, under certain conditions, to send pupil-teachers to a school, whether carried on for profit or not, and yet earn on them a grant, such grant being payable to the local education authority.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) It will be possible under the Pupil-Teacher Regulations for 1905–6 for grants to be earned for pupil-teachers attending schools conducted for private profit. Grants so earned will be paid to the local education authority.

Issue of Regulations under the Weights and Measures Act, 1904.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether he can state when the regulations under the Weights and Measures Act, 1904, with respect to the verification and stamping of weights and measures and weighing and measuring instruments will be laid upon the Table of the House; and whether the Board of Trade will undertake that such general regulations, when issued, shall not clash with their prior approval of samples which have been submitted to the Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Bonar Law.*) Progress is being made with the drafting of the regulations in question, but I cannot say when the Board will be in a position to lay them before the House. Pending the making of the new regulations the regulations made by local authorities under the Weights and Measures Act, 1889, remain in operation. In framing the new regulations the point to which attention is drawn in the concluding portion of the Question will, of course, be borne in mind.

The Indian Viceroy and Lord Kitchener's Army Proposals.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has received from the Viceroy of India a communication that unless certain modifications in the proposed new scheme of Indian Army administration are agreed to by the Cabinet his resignation will take place; and, if so, when was such a communication received, and what are its precise terms; and what are the precise modifications in the scheme desired by the Viceroy and Government of India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I can only refer the hon. Member to my reply on the 28th ultimo† to a similar Question asked by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy Burghs. I am not yet in a position to make any further statement.

Promotion of Assistant Clerks in National Education Office, Dublin.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state if the circumstances which prevented the Irish Government from recommending the proposal for the promotion of assistant clerks serving in the National Education Office, Dublin, now obtain; whether he is aware that an immediate saving of from £12 to £15 a year would be effected by the promotion of each assistant clerk recommended in this case; and whether, in consideration of this fact, and of the suspense endured by these officers as compared with officers promoted in other Departments, he will see whether the recommendations can now be carried out.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The reply to the first inquiry is in the affirmative. I am not at present prepared to re-open the consideration of the matter.

Applications for Reinstatement by Evicted Tenants in County Waterford.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say what number of applications for reinstatement by evicted tenants have been received, since the passing of the Land Act of 1903, by the Estates Commissioners from the county Waterford.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) Two hundred and ten, of which six appear to be outside the provisions of the Act.

Grazing Lands on the King-Harman Estate.

Mr. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state in how many cases on the King-Harman Estate have the Estates Commissioners offered to purchase large grazing farms from the vendor as untenanted land; what are the names of the present occupiers of these farms, and what were their yearly rents before the sale of the estate; and whether he can give the amounts, including the bonus, which the Estates Commissioners have intimated through their inspector or negotiator that they are prepared to advance to the vendor for each of these farms respectively as untenanted land.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I am not prepared to give any further information in this matter than that which I gave in reply to the hon. Member's Question of the 22nd May‡. It would be undesirable and contrary to practice to give particulars of pending negotiations for the purchase of lands by the Commissioners.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxlviii., 373.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxlvi., 952.

The King-Harman Estate.

MR. TULLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners can state in how many cases since they have become the owners of the King-Harman Estate have they refused to sanction the sale by one tenant to another of the tenant's interests in their holdings; can they explain on what grounds and at whose instigation they refused permission to the National Bank to sell the tenant's interest in Corrigard and Termon holdings to Surgeon-Colonel Smith and ex-County Inspector Scott respectively; and whether they intend to pursue the same policy in the case of other farms where the tenant's interest is offered for sale on this estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The Answer to the first inquiry is, in no case.

Purchase of Turbary on the King-Harman Estate.

MR. TULLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners can state the total sum advanced for the purchase of the turbary on the King-Harman Estate, and the amount of the yearly instalment for the repayment of this sum; what is the total amount of the salaries paid at present by the turbary trustees approved of by the Estates Commissioners; what steps have been taken by the Estates Commissioners, or the trustees approved of by them, to publish to the tenants the terms of the trust deed dealing with the fuel supply; and where can a copy of this trust deed be inspected by any of the tenants on this estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The amount of the purchase money was £1,338, and the annuity thereon is £43 9s. 8d. The Commissioners have no information as to the second inquiry, the matter not being under their control. A certified copy of the statutory scheme dealing with the turbary has been furnished to the trustees, and it is presumed that an application to them by any person interested in or affected by the scheme for an inspection of the same would be duly entertained.

Grazing Lands at Clew Bay, County Mayo.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Congested Districts Board recently purchased some islands in Clew Bay, near Newport, county Mayo; that those islands have been let to graziers who live long distances away, while the neighbouring tenants were much in need of them; and if he can say why they were not leased or sold to the neighbouring tenants whose holdings are small and uneconomic.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The Board issued public notices calling for tenders for the grazing on these islands, and in every case in which the Board's tenants sent in tenders their tenders were accepted, but this occurred in the case of only three islands out of the entire number. The islands will ultimately be added to the holdings of tenants on neighbouring estates purchased by the Board, but the title to the islands has not yet been vested in the Board.

The O'Donell Estate, Newport, County Mayo.

DR. AMBROSE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the 27th ult. application was made on behalf of the Congested Districts Board to the Court of Chancery for the purchase of the O'Donell Estate at Newport, county Mayo; that the sale was postponed until November next; can he say why the sale was postponed; and whether, considering the poverty of the surrounding tenants, he will use his influence with a view to expediting the sale of the estate, so that their holdings may be enlarged.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The Congested Districts Board have issued a request under Section 77 of the Act of 1903 with regard to this estate. The application referred to was not made by the Board, but by the solicitors having carriage of the sale. The Land Judge directed the case to stand till next sittings, the receiver in the meantime to negotiate with the agricultural tenants as to the prices they would be prepared to pay to the Board for their holdings. The tenants are very numerous, and it was considered that any shorter adjournment would have been useless.

Promotion in Irish Agricultural Department.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state on what grounds he refuses to grant the independent inquiry asked for into the methods of promotion prevailing in the Irish Agricultural Department, seeing that the Press and the local bodies in Ireland have repeatedly expressed the view that the facts demand an independent examination.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have already stated that I have carefully looked into the facts of this case, and am satisfied that no further inquiry is called for. I have nothing to add to that statement.

Irish Poor Law Reform Commission—Publication of Report.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can explain the cause of delay in presenting the Reports of the Irish Poor Law Reform Commission.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) There has been no avoidable delay. The proceedings of the Commission, which have necessarily been very exhaustive, are approaching completion, and the Commissioners hope to present their Report before the close of the present year.

Government Orders for Bayonets.

MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will cause bayonet orders for a larger amount than 2,500 to be placed with private firms within the present year, inasmuch as some 19,000 have already been turned out from the Ordnance Factories, 12,000 are still required to complete stock and reserve, and the proportion of private allocation is much higher in the case of other warlike stores and requisites.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) Will the hon. Member kindly refer to my reply to a Question put by the hon. Member for Central Sheffield on the 5th instant.†

Drainage of Bordon Camp, Hampshire.

COLONEL WYNDHAM MURRAY Bath): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any drainage takes place from Bordon Camp, Hampshire, into the sources of the River Wey, which flows into the Thames; and, if so, what steps are being taken by the military authorities to prevent pollution of the rivers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) No unpurified sewage from Bordon Camp discharges into the River Wey. The effluent from the Bordon sewage works eventually finds its way, as must any such discharge in that locality, into the Wey, which is the natural watercourse draining that area. Difficulties have been experienced in attaining the degree of purification of the effluent desired by the river authorities, and the matter has been and is receiving very special attention, and every endeavour is being made to put matters upon a proper footing.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Army Efficiency.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when the Regular troops on home stations were last medically examined; and if he will pledge himself that, with the exception of those temporarily incapacitated by sickness, all are first-class shots and physically ready for active service, and that every precaution has been taken to prevent the recurrence of the state of affairs in 1899, when 36¼ per cent. of the Regular Army was unable to embark for the field.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Regular soldiers at home are under constant medical supervision, both by means of the ordinary routine inspection of the medical officer or of special examination for gymnastic courses, service abroad, extensions of service, etc., or on the orders of commanding officers for the investigation of some defect which may interfere with a man's usefulness as a soldier. I cannot give a pledge that, with the exception of those temporarily incapacitated by sickness, all the men are first-class shots and physically ready for active service; but on mobilisation in 1899 it was found that 3·9 per cent. of the men returned as unable to embark were disqualified on the ground of medical unfitness, while 31·5 per cent. were unfit on account of non-fulfilment of age and service conditions. I consider the proportion of those unfit to embark is too high, and every effort is being made to reduce it, though, of course, there will always be a considerable proportion of men disqualified on account of their being under twenty years of age or insufficiently trained. As regards the musketry qualification, there is no regulation requiring Regular soldiers to be first-class shots as a condition of active service.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxlviii., 1121.

Liability for Debts of Volunteer Battalions Disbanded.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will undertake that, in the event of its being found necessary to disband any Volunteer battalions, no pecuniary liability for expense legitimately incurred by commanding officers on behalf of the corps shall be allowed to fall upon such commanding officers.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Volunteer Regulations contain definite provisions regarding the finances of corps on disbandment, and there is no reason to suppose that these provisions are inadequate.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: But suppose any corps are disbanded under this order of January 20th, will any pecuniary liabilities rest upon the commanding officer?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: There is no proposal in this circular to disband Volunteer corps. Where they have been disbanded in the past they have been dealt with under the regulation which I have just quoted.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE asked whether the circular relating to the efficiency of the Volunteers had been withdrawn.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir.

The Volunteers—The Recent Circular.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many Volunteer battalions have been reported unfit for war; by whom such reports were made, and to whom; whether every soldier enlisted into the Army has no defect likely to interfere with marching or active service; whether all Regular soldiers are first class-shots; and whether, if all Regular soldiers liable for foreign service do not fulfil the above conditions, he can state for what reasons they are to be applied to Volunteers whose only obligations are for home service.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Nearly all the Volunteer battalions are in the same position as the Line battalions, that is to say, they are unfit for active service abroad until those men who do not fulfil the necessary conditions have been withdrawn from the ranks. In the case of the Regular Army facilities exist for filling up the vacancies from the Army Reserve. No such resource exists in the case of the Volunteers. In reply to the second part of the Question, the Answer is that many soldiers in the Regular Army are unfit for active service abroad. These men will not be utilised in case of war until they become fit. I consider the number larger than it need be, and the Army Council is making every effort to reduce the proportion of unfit men both by increasing the number of long-service men and by increasing the proportion of rejections of those medically unfit. All Regular soldiers are not first-class shots, but the Army Council has the means of ascertaining what number of men in all mobilised battalions are first-class shots. They desire to obtain the same information with regard to such of the Volunteers as might offer themselves for active service abroad. No obligation is imposed on the Volunteers in this respect. It is quite true that the Volunteers are enlisted for home service only, but past experience has shown that many of them may be relied upon for active service abroad in time of war. It is therefore considered absolutely necessary to make suitable arrangements beforehand for the employment of officers and men who will volunteer.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: How many Volunteer battalions have been reported unfit for war, and by whom were such reports made?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I have answered that Question. No Volunteer battalions are fit for foreign service in their present condition.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: That is not an Answer to the Question whether any Volunteer battalions have been reported as unfit, and, if so, how many.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: My Answer is perfectly clear. We are dealing merely with men who are likely to be engaged on active service abroad. No Volunteer battalion complies with the condition of fitness for active service abroad. It requires no report; it is perfectly well known.

Mr. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman state how he defines the words "a first-class shot" as applied to the Volunteers.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The hon. Gentleman had better give me notice of that Question.

Mr. C. R. SPENCER (Northamptonshire, Mid.): Has any officer commanding Volunteer corps answered the circular?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I understand that a great many commanding officers are doing their best to obtain the information that we require, and no doubt we shall receive their reports as soon as they have obtained it.

Major SEELY (Isle of Wight): I do not think the right hon. Gentleman understands the Question. In the circular to which my hon. friend refers the information is asked for on the ground that many Volunteer units are reported as not in a fit state to take the field. My hon. friend desires to know by whom the reports were made, and by whom they were received.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Report of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission states that many battalions are unfit for war.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: Was the circular based on the Report of the Norfolk Commission, and nothing else?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It is based on the Report of the Norfolk Commission and a great deal of other information submitted to the War Office. We are dealing entirely and solely with Volunteer battalions for service abroad. No Volunteer battalions are so fit.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: By whom, and to whom, were the reports made?

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud) asked whether the period for the inspection ordered by the recent circular had been postponed.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes. I thought the time was too short. We have extended the time to October.

The Army Council and the Volunteers.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can inform the House of the text of the Resolution of the Army Council with regard to the physical and dental examination of the Volunteer force for active service now proceeding, and the date at which it was arrived at; and, further, if prior thereto the Director of Auxiliary Forces and the Assistant Director for Volunteers were called into consultation.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The decisions of the Army Council are confidential, and I am not, therefore, in a position to give my hon. and gallant friend any information in regard to the Question.

MAJOR SEELY: Was the Assistant Director of Volunteers consulted in any way?

MR ARNOLD-FORSTER: I do not interfere in such matters.

MAJOR SEELY: He was not consulted.

Case of Convict Thomas Leonard at Maryborough.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, when the Army Council considered the case of Thomas Leonard, now imprisoned in Maryborough under a life sentence for desertion, the Council was aware that the desertion took place more than a year before the outbreak of the war, and that Leonard, who was employed at the mines, was commandeered by the Boers on the outbreak of the war; and, if not, will he put this fact before the Council and ask for a reconsideration of Leonard's case; whether he can explain what circumstances influenced the decision of the Army Council in ordering the discharge two years ago from Maryborough Prison of a man who belonged to the same regiment as Leonard, and who was sentenced to death for the murder of a soldier in South Africa during the late war, while refusing to discharge Leonard, who has now been over five years in prison for desertion.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Army Council is aware that Thomas Leonard deserted before the outbreak of war. The evidence given at the Court-martial by which he was tried and sentenced for the offences of desertion and treason, showed that he had not been commandeered by the Boers. Leonard was sentenced in October, 1902, and accordingly only completes three years of his sentence in October next, when his release will be considered if his conduct is good. He was sentenced to penal servitude for life for treason, as well as desertion, in that he was found fighting against his country at Paardeberg. The case of Private Coughlan, released from Maryborough Prison in 1903, was fully stated in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for Kilkenny on February 28th † last. That case was quite different as the man, who had been convicted for murdering a comrade with a rifle, appeared to have been not entirely responsible for his action at the time, owing to his physical and mental condition.

In reply to a further Question the right hon. Gentleman said the case would have favourable consideration when it came up for review.

Joint Stock Enterprises in the Transvaal.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the laws governing the flotation and operations of joint stock enterprises in the Transvaal remain the same to-day as they were before the annexation of the country by the British Crown; and, if so, whether he will consider the advisability of moving the Transvaal Government to make such alterations as will assimilate those laws more closely with those which have been found necessary and expedient for the control of joint stock enterprise and the protection of the investing public in the United Kingdom.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): Some amending legislation has been passed since annexation, but the principal law regulating the management of companies remains the Law No. 5 of 1874. The Transvaal Government has drafted a law consolidating the whole of the Company Law on the lines of the English Acts, 1862 to 1900, but was unable to proceed with legislation last session. I will inquire whether it is proposed to proceed with the Bill during the present session.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Can Ministers of the Crown act as directors of public companies in the Transvaal as in this country?

[No Answer was returned.]

Collection of British Trade Statistics Abroad.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether any general instructions have been given to Consuls to collect information as regards trade with the United Kingdom as a whole, thereby releasing them from any obligation to use their best endeavours to secure information as to the trade with Ireland specifically.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 1449.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): It is the duty of the Consular officers in the first place to collect information as regards trade with the United Kingdom as a whole, but no instruction has been issued discouraging them from securing such information as may be available as to trade with the various parts of the United Kingdom separately. Special Reports have, however, from time to time been obtained from His Majesty's representatives abroad at the request of the Irish Department of Agriculture on matters of interest to Ireland.

Motor-Car Speed in Essex.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received the resolution of the Essex County Council of July 4th as to the desirability of empowering justices to impose a severer penalty than fines on motorists who drive through populous districts and narrow roads to the danger of the public; and what steps he will take to give effect to the resolution.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I have rereceived the resolution referred to. The expediency of increasing the penalties for offences under the Motor-Car Acts is one of the matters which would come within the scope of the inquiry which the Government propose to institute as to the working of these Acts.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): Can the right hon. Gentleman give any idea when the inquiry will be commenced and when finished?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I hope the inquiry will commence with as little delay as possible.

Holborn Municipal Finance Disclosures.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the recent proceedings at the meeting of the Holborn Borough Council, and to the fact that a special investigation committee recommended that Mr. Lewis H. Isaacs be proceeded against under the provisions of The Statutory Declarations Act, 1835; and whether, in view of the refusal of the borough council to take proceedings recommended by its special committee, the Local Government Board will take steps in furtherance of the public interest and to vindicate justice.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am aware of the proceedings referred to. I understand that in consequence of the action taken by the auditor at the audit Mr. Isaacs has refunded a sum of over £600, and admitted that his future compensation should be reduced by £159 18s. 5d. per annum. I am informed that the debate with respect to the steps to be taken by the borough council in relation to Mr. Isaacs' conduct stands adjourned until the next meeting of the council.

MR. FLYNN: Is it not the fact that the special investigation committee took counsel's opinion before they made the recommendation? Can the right hon. Gentleman say what that opinion was?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not in a position to answer that Question.

Amalgamation of Transvaal Companies.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the proposed amalgamation of the Johannesburg Consolidated Investment and the Barnato Consolidated Investment Companies; whether he is aware that a large amount of English and European capital is invested in these concerns, and that attempts to raise further capital in this country are now being made; and whether, seeing that owing to these companies being registered in the Transvaal the English and European shareholders have no means of protecting their interests or of representing their views, he will bring this transaction to the notice of the Committee which is at present inquiring into these subjects.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. BONAR LAW, Glasgow, Blackfriars): I have no knowledge of the case mentioned, but the attention of the Committee has been specially directed by the Board of Trade to the question of companies registered abroad and appealing to investors in this country.

Merionethshire Education Grant.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether any grants or instalments of grant which in the ordinary course would have become due and payable to the local education authority of Merionethshire prior to 1st July have been withheld; what is the total amount which has been withheld; and what is the total amount which the local education authority is alleged to be in arrear in respect of payments due to non-provided schools.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): No grants or instalments of grants which have accrued for payment during the first three months of the financial year have been withheld; though from the sums which have accrued the Board have made deductions amounting to £1,120 to meet payments made to managers in respect of expenses properly incurred by them between September 30th, 1903, and October 31st, 1904. The Board have been in correspondence with the local education authority in reference to the payment of an instalment of aid grant, and the payment would have been made before now had the assurances been received which have been asked for by the Board as to the fulfilment of certain legal requirements. I am afraid I cannot state exactly what further deductions it will be necessary for the Board to make to meet payments made to managers in respect of the above-named period, but I think it is quite probable that they may amount to another £500 or £600.

Scottish Churches Bill—Government Amendments.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether, in order to facilitate progress with the Churches (Scotland) Bill, he will place on the Notice Paper the Amendments on clauses to be proposed on behalf of the Government, or print the clauses as they are intended to stand after the Second Reading of the Bill.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): The Amendments to be proposed by the Government will be placed on the Notice Paper as soon as possible after the Second Reading of the Bill.

The Crimes Act—Proclaimed Districts in Ireland.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the several counties and districts in Ireland which are at the present time proclaimed under Sections 3 or 4, or both, of The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, together with the date of such proclamation and the names of the Privy Councillors who signed the same.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): There are fifteen counties and four county boroughs still proclaimed under these provisions of the Act, and there are two sets of proclamations, with different signatures attached. I am giving the hon. and learned Member a list with all the information he desires; it is too lengthy to read.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The detailed information is not of a very long character, and in view of the great public interest in the matter, will the right hon. Gentleman state here the names of the districts proclaimed and the names of the Privy Councillors who signed the proclamation.

MR. WALTER LONG read the list as printed on page 65.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): Is the right hon.

Gentleman aware that at the assizes for King's County held only last week the Judge congratulated that county on its crimelessness?

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): And is the right hon. Gentleman aware that at the Limerick Assizes last Thursday there were no cases for the city of Limerick? Why is that city, with its crimelessness and where white gloves are continually presented to the Judges, to be kept under this proclamation?

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Does the Government intend to continue the Crimes Act in force in these counties and districts?

Mr. WALTER LONG: The Government does not propose to make any change at present.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I there any reason why Dublin City should be proclaimed?

Mr. WALTER LONG. That proclamation was issued in the time of my pre decessor. I see no reason to make any change at present. I should be very glad indeed if I could.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Why is not Belfast proclaimed?

[No Answer was returned.]

Derry M'Edmond Estate, Clonlish, King's County.

Mr. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now say if the Land Commission have come to the conclusion that a larger sum than £500 can be advanced to Mr. Frend for the purchase of his holding, situated on the Derry M'Edmond Estate in therbarony of Clonlish, King's County, formerly in the possession of Amos Palmer Doolan, without prejudice to the wants and circumstances of other persons residing in the neighbourhood, in view of the fact that these lands are surrounded by small holdings that it would be desirable to increase; and that the sons of small farmers in the neighbourhood are anxious for farms.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The Commissioners have not yet come to a decision as to the amount of the advance to be made in this case.

F. G. Mayberry Estate, Kenmare.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that all the estates held by middlemen under Trinity College in the neighbourhood of Kenmare have been sold to the tenants, with the exception of the F. G. Mayberry estate; that there are at least eight evicted tenants of this estate who have not been restored to their holdings; and that the condition of the other tenants was disclosed at the inquiry held by the Trinity College Commission last year; and whether, in view of the applications for purchase made by the tenants, he will call the attention of the Estates Commissioners to this estate.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Mr. Mayberry's estate has not yet come before the Commissioners, but I am informed that negotiations for sale to tenants are proceeding. The applications of the evicted tenants will be considered when the estate comes before the Commissioners.

Mr. BOLAND: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the tenants can get no answer from this landlord to their request that negotiations should be entered upon?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I am not aware of that.

Ulster's Claim on the Technical Instruction Grant.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will expend the whole or part of the surplus of £237,000 lying to the credit of the Board of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, either in reduction of the charges on the city of Belfast in respect of its technical institute, or in establishing an agricultural college in such a central position in Ulster as to be of real benefit to students in that province.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The surplus moneys referred to consist of unexpended balances of that portion of the Department's endowment which is applicable to expenditure on agricultural industries or sea fisheries. Legislation would appear to be necessary, therefore, for the application of any portion of this surplus in respect of technical instruction. I am informed that the agricultural station in Ulster is situated near the railway junction at Clones and is easy of access from all parts of the province. It is the intention of the Department to promote the establishment of additional stations in Ulster when a supply of qualified teachers becomes available.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the agricultural station is on the extreme edge of Ulster and in a most inaccessible part?

[No Answer was returned.]

Cost of Teaching Irish in Irish Schools.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what amount has been expended by the Board of National Education in Ireland, in each of the years 1902, 1903, and 1904, on the teaching of Irish as an extra subject in schools.

MR. WALTER LONG: In 1902, £3,050; in 1903, £7,220; and in 1904, £12,069.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: What return is there for the expenditure of this enormous sum of money? Could it not be devoted to more useful purposes?

[No Answer was returned.]

Political Discussions at Irish Teachers' Meetings.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will lay upon the Table of this House the circular which has lately been sent to the national school teachers by the Board of Education in Ireland on the subject of the discussion of political questions at their meetings; and also the correspondence which led up to that circular.

MR. WALTER LONG: Yes, Sir; this will be done.

Malicious Outrage in County Tipperary.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the 3rd June a bull was maliciously injured at Ballyphilip, county Tipperary, by having a portion of its tongue cut out; what is the motive for this injury; and whether the police have been able to trace the perpetrator.

MR. WALTER LONG: Yes, Sir. At the hearing of the owner's claim for compensation, the motive assigned for this outrage was that the owner had taken the grazing farm on which the animal was grazing when injured. The police have not succeeded in tracing the perpetrator, but are using every effort to do so.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: How do you know the motive then?

Irish Lord Chancellor and Statute made Magistrates.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Mr. Kelly, who has been appointed chairman of Loughrea District Council, is the Mr. P. J. Kelly who in November last, at a meeting at Loughrea, stated that people should be shot down for giving extravagant prices for land; and who, at a meeting on 29th December dealing with the negotiations for the purchase of the Clancarty Estate, said that if there were any renegades on that estate they would be shot down like dogs; and whether, seeing that Mr. Kelly becomes a justice of the peace by virtue of his appointment as chairman of a district council, the Lord Chancellor intends to permit Mr. Kelly to retain His Majesty's commission of the peace, in view of the incitement to breaches of the peace which he has made.

MR. WALTER LONG: I have referred this Question to the Lord Chancellor, whose observations are as follows: "Mr. Kelly became a magistrate under the provisions of the Local Government Act without the need of any commission, sanction, or approval from the Lord

Chancellor, and he only thereupon became amenable to the jurisdiction of the Lord Chancellor under the enactment which places him in the same position as other Irish magistrates in respect of conduct after he became a magistrate; but this power does not authorise the Lord Chancellor to inquire into speeches made several months before his election."

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: Then if such a magistrate commits a serious crime has the Lord Chancellor no power over him?

***Mr. SPEAKER**: Order, order! That seems to be a hypothetical Question.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: With all respect, Sir, it is not. [Cries of "Order."]

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): It is a question of time. What is the limit of time which debars action by the Lord Chancellor?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I really think my hon. friends are unduly pressing me. Obviously in a matter such as this I can only give the answer I received from the Lord Chancellor. I do not think I am called upon to say what he may do in certain hypothetical cases.

Mr. SLOAN: But what is the length of period which debars action?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I have given the Lord Chancellor's reply. Until the person in question is made a magistrate and comes under his jurisdiction he has no power over him.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): The Lord Chancellor refused to reprimand Sir Douglas Brooke, an Orange magistrate, for a speech he made while a magistrate as to arming his tenantry with guns.

Mr. FLAVIN: Is it not the fact that these men became entitled to act as magistrates under an Act passed through this House by a Tory Government?

[No Answer was returned.]

The Police and Bunting Displays at Armagh.

Mr. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the district inspector of police in Armagh visited the houses of Catholic licensed vintners in the city who displayed flags or bunting from their premises on the occasion of the consecration of the Catholic Cathedral, and compelled the removal of these flags; and that the same officer permitted the Protestant licensed traders to decorate their premises with flags on the 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th ultimo; and will he state on what grounds were the latter displays permitted and a distinction made in favour of traders of one persuasion.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The warning which was given by the local police to the publicans of Armagh on the occasion first mentioned was given in error, the police having misunderstood the effect of the instructions they had received. The occasion mentioned in the second inquiry was that of an agricultural show, when the town was decorated by persons of all creeds. The question of religion does not arise. On neither occasion were the flags displayed of a Party character, and on neither occasion was a prosecution instituted.

Conna (Cork) Evicted Tenant.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement to his former holding from Mr. Thomas O'Keeffe, an evicted tenant on the Wallis Estate, Curriglas, Conna, county Cork; and what action will be taken by the Commissioners in the matter.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Yes, Sir. The Commissioners will consider the application if the estate should come before them.

Waterford Evicted Tenants.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland in how many cases and on what estates in the county Waterford have the Estates Commissioners entered into negotiation with landlords with the view of reinstating evicted tenants; what has been the result of such negotiations; have the Estates Commissioners been able to acquire any land, and, if so, how much for the reinstatement of evicted tenants on other parts of the estate from which such tenants were evicted, or on any other estate, in cases where the farms previously occupied by them have been let.

Mr. WALTER LONG: There have been negotiations in fourteen cases. Seven evicted tenants have been reinstated. The Commissioners have acquired a holding of forty acres for the reinstatement of another tenant, and proceedings are pending for the acquisition of 456 acres for the restoration of three others.

Mr. POWER: Will the right hon. Gentleman communicate with the Estates Commissioners, with a view to inducing them to open negotiations with landlords who have large tracts of vacant land available?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I should like to consider that.

Arterial Drainage in Ireland.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has yet arranged the terms of reference to the Commissioners who are to inquire into the subject of arterial drainage in Ireland; and, if so, will he state their names and qualifications and the specific terms of reference.

Mr. WALTER LONG: I have nothing to add to my previous replies to similar Questions.

The Absconding of Constable Masterson.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the failure of Constable Masterson, Royal Irish Constabulary, to surrender to his bail at the late Maryborough Assizes; and, seeing that the grand jury found a true bill against Masterson, who was charged with feloniously wounding and using unnecessary violence in the arrest of Edward Carroll near Mountmellick on the night of the 17th March last, whether he can say what steps are being taken to prevent Masterson absconding, and why the Crown accepted his own personal recognisances.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The constable failed to appear at assizes, and a warrant for his arrest was at once issued. At the time his personal recognisances were accepted there was no reason to apprehend that he would abscond. His present whereabouts are unknown, but the police are endeavouring to trace him.

Mr. JOYCE: If you communicate with ex-Sergeant Sheridan you will find him.

Mr. DELANY: Who was responsible for this man? Was he not living in the police barracks?

Mr. WALTER LONG: He was out on his own recognisances.

Kerry Evicted Tenants.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have up to the present time succeeded in reinstating a single evicted tenant in the county of Kerry, notwithstanding that 411 applications have been sent to them dealing with persons evicted from their homes; and whether he proposes to take any steps to ensure the more effective carrying out of the policy of the Land Act of 1903 in reference to the reinstatement of evicted tenants.

Mr. WALTER LONG: I have nothing to add to the replies which I have already given to Questions on this subject.

Mr. MURPHY: I have not before asked if the Estates Commissioners have succeeded in reinstating one evicted tenant in Kerry County?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I believe I stated in answer to a Question the other day that nineteen such tenants have been, or are in process of being, re-instated by the landlords.

Mr. MURPHY: That is not the point. How many have the Estates Commissioners reinstated?

Mr. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in the Parliamentary Division I represent, although more than half the land has been sold and there is much vacant land, not a single bit has been purchased by the Estates Commissioners for the purpose of reinstating evicted tenants?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I am not aware of it.

Galway—Special Jurors' Qualifications.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the fact that the qualifications of special jurors in the county of Galway are freehold interests in lands to the extent of £10 a year, leasehold interests yielding £20 a year, rated occupation of lands to the amount of £100, directorships of banking and certain other companies, and membership of a harbour board or dock board, and that few persons who would be qualified under the last two provisions are not connected with the ownership of land, whether he will reconsider the question of the appointment of a special jury of that county for the trial of agrarian offences.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Special jurors must belong to five classes. In four of these classes the qualification is the same for special and common jurors. In the remaining class only is there any difference, namely, the class of rated occupiers. In this class the qualification is £100 rating in counties and £50 in towns for special juries, as distinguished from £40 and £10 respectively for common juries. Orders for special juries were obtained in the cases referred to because it was believed that such juries would be fairer and more impartial than common juries. Orders having been made by the King's Bench Division that the cases in question should be tried by special juries, I have no power to interfere even if I desired to do so.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is it not the fact that the Court of King's Bench must grant the application?

Mr. WALTER LONG was understood to reply in the affirmative.

Relief of the Education Rate.

Mr. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will at once introduce legislation in order to secure relief to necessitous districts with regard to the burden of the education rate.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): This important matter is still engaging attention; but I am not in a position to make any statement on the subject, nor do I think that legislation in the course of the present session would, in any case, be possible.

Mr. LOUIS SINCLAIR: But when the East Ham Borough Council rescinded the resolution they were assured by the Prime Minister that——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! This is the time to ask, not to give, information.

Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.

Mr. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is able to state when the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline will issue its Report.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Answer I gave to a similar Question on a previous occasion still holds good. I have every reason to believe that the Report will be in the hands of the public before long, but I am not able to give any pledge on the subject.

The Unemployed Bill.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now fix a definite date upon which the Committee stage of the Unemployed Workmen Bil will be taken.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The condition of public business does not enable me to give any pledge on this subject.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether we can have an assurance that the Committee stage will be taken before the session comes to an end?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Gentleman will feel that the pledge he asks for, even if it could be given, would be a very inexpedient one to give. What is eminently desirable is that the Bill should pass. Nothing is gained by passing the Committee stage without the rest of the Bill.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman will give the Bill preference over the Redistribution Resolutions as a matter of urgent importance?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman appears to think the Redistribution Resolutions of no importance. I differ from the hon. Gentleman.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in view of the pledge which I think the House and the country understood him to give that the Unemployed Bill would be passed—if the word pledge has any meaning at all—the Government will do their best to pass the Bill?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I certainly desire to pass the Unemployed Bill, as I have always desired; but I do not know in what sense the hon. Gentleman uses the word pledge. I use it in its accepted signification.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: May I ask whether the Prime Minister has received communications from the demonstrations in favour of the Unemployed Bill which have now been held all over the country, and whether, in view of the public demand for the Bill, he will give it precedence over other subjects for which there is no public demand and which are relatively of less importance?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have received resolutions about this Bill from many parts of the country and from many bodies, including the London County Council, who appear to take an adverse view of some of its main provisions; but when the hon. Gentleman gives his comparative estimate——

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: The country's comarpative estimate, not mine.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: His comparative estimate, supported by what he thinks is the country's estimate, he must allow me to take a different opinion.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: I will raise the question again.

The Butter Bill.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, as the Sale of Butter Bill is one of great concern to butter producers, he will afford facilities for its passage into law this session.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): At the same time may I ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now say when he proposes to take the Second Reading of the Sale of Butter Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am desirous of passing the Sale of Butter Bill into law, but whether it is possible to do so in the course of the present session must depend on the way in which the House chooses to occupy its time.

Redistribution Resolutions.

Mr. GEORGE KENYON (Denbigh Boroughs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, seeing the limited time during which it will be possible for Members to consider the probable effect of his Redistribution Resolutions, he will lay upon the Table at once such information and statistics as are available to enable them to form an approximate idea of their results, more especially as affecting the relative position of the constituent parts of the United Kingdom.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope my right hon. friend will lay the Resolutions and some explanatory statements and figures with regard to them on the Table of the House immediately. [Some cries of "When?"] I hope they will be in the hands of Members to-morrow.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Who is going to lay them on the Table of the House? Who, among the galaxy on that bench, is "my right hon. friend"?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman may devote his time to discussing with his friends who the right hon. Gentleman is likely to be among those who sit upon this bench.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: A most improper Answer—most discourteous. Keep your temper.

Customs Vote.

Mr. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is now able to say on what date the Vote for the Customs Service will be submitted to the House.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot name any day. Of course the claim of this Vote will be considered in arranging the business of the House along with other subjects which require discussion.

The Colonial Conference.

Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is intended to hold a Colonial Conference in the year 1906; and, if so, whether the British representatives at such conference will be free to discuss the advisability of a system of preferential trading based on the taxation of food and raw material imported into this country.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have nothing to add to what I have already said, I am afraid at undue length, upon this subject.

The Inquiry into the Working of the Motor-Car Act.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he proposes to set up a Royal Commission, Statutory Commission, Departmental Committee, or Parliamentary Committee to inquire into the working of The Motor-Car Act, 1903.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It is proposed that the inquiry should take place by means of a Royal Commission.

Mr. SOARES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the majority by which the First Reading of a Bill to amend The Motor-Car Act, 1903, was carried, and having regard to the number of accidents which have recently happened owing to the dangerous driving of motor-cars, he will give facilities for this Bill, which is framed with the sole object of preventing driving to the public danger, and enable it to become law this session.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman gives me two reasons why this Bill should be treated with peculiar favour. The one is that the division on the First Reading showed a very large majority in favour of the First Reading, and the other is that the Bill is brought in with the best intentions. I would point out that, as a rule, the First Reading of most private Members' Bills is passed unanimously, and that good intentions are, I hope, a characteristic of all legislation brought into this House.

Public Accounts Committee's Report.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now say what arrangement he proposes to make in order to carry out the undertaking given on 17th April to give either one of the days allotted to Supply, if the House agrees, or otherwise a Friday or an evening sitting, for the consideration by the House of the Public Accounts Committee's Report, and its decision thereon.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope to give the evening of Wednesday, July 26th, for the discussion which my hon. friend presses for, but that must be subject to unforeseen contingencies.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: One unforeseen circumstance is that we are getting merely an evening instead of a whole day.

Minister of Commerce.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he intends to introduce this session the measure, promised in His Majesty's Speech from the Throne, to raise the *status* of the Local Government Board and the Board of Trade and to create a Minister of Commerce.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it is desirable to introduce the Bill, but whether it is proceeded with obviously depends on whether it is treated as an uncontentious measure or not.

Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act has been repeatedly promised by the Government, he will give an early opportunity to complete the Second Reading debate in order that the Bill may be sent to a Standing Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It would be quite vain for me to allocate time for the further stages of this Bill unless I had some reasonable hope of passing it into law, but I can give no final Answer on the subject at present.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck): May I ask whether, having regard to the specific charges which have been brought on this subject against the Opposition in general and the Labour Members in particular, the right hon. Gentleman will take care that due notice is given of his intention to resume the debate on the Second Reading of this Bill so that answers may be given to those charges?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not aware that any charges have been made against the hon. Gentleman. Of course, I am always desirous of giving what notice I can of Bills, and I am sure the hon. Gentleman would be glad to see the measure pressed on under any circumstances.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—SIR E GREY'S VOTE OF CENSURE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I wish to put to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House a Question which I deferred at his request two or three days ago—namely, whether, in view of the very explicit statement he made last week, in moving his Motion regarding the Aliens Bill, as to the future prospects of the session, he will now state the measures which the Government propose to proceed with and those which they propose to abandon. There are two other Questions I would ask of the right hon. Gentleman. The first is whether it is understood, as I think it has been amicably settled, that the Volunteer Vote will be taken on Thursday; and the second is what day he will give for the fiscal Motion of my right hon. friend the Member for Berwick.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I desire to thank the right hon. Gentleman for deferring his Question till to-day, and to express my regret that I was not able to be present in the House last Thursday. With regard to the matter of the Question, I have to point out to the House that it is extremely early in the session to make a general declaration with regard to immediate business, and I do not think anything would be gained by it. I have already told the House that it is clear that we must pass the Aliens Bill and the Resolutions on redistribution, if the House consents so to do, and that we must deal with the ecclesiastical difficulties in Scotland; but I think it would be very inadvisable at the present time to go further into details. With regard to the Volunteer Vote, I was informed at the rising of the House last Thursday that the Irish Members were prepared to give up a day which had been allocated to them in favour of this Vote——

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Postpone.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, to defer their day in favour of the Volunteer Vote;

and I was strongly pressed by one or two hon. Gentlemen below the gangway to give Thursday for that purpose, I replied that, in my judgment, the Secretary of State's Vote, on which larger and more general questions could be raised, would be a very fitting subject for the only remaining day which we can afford to Army matters, but that, of course, if it was the view of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, with the full consciousness that this was the last day, that the Volunteer Vote should be taken first, I should, in accordance with the principles which were laid down some years ago, and which I have endeavoured scrupulously to follow, take the Volunteer Vote first. I understand that the right hon. Gentleman, having considered all the circumstances of the case, is of opinion that the critics of the Government would prefer the Volunteer Vote before the Secretary of State's Vote; and that being the position, I have no alternative but to arrange that the Volunteer Vote shall come first on Thursday and the Secretary of State's Vote second. I hope it will be so arranged that some time may be left for the more general discussion on the Secretary of State's Vote.

As to the final Question of the right hon. Gentleman, it came upon me really with the shock of a surprise. He asks that I should now fix a day for the discussion of the Motion put down in the name of the right hon. Member for Berwick. I think it was six weeks ago when we originally thought of discussing that Motion, and I am afraid it was owing not to my fault, but to my misfortune, that the discussion was not then taken. I was ill, and the vote was deferred. Then we had a debate on this very subject on the question of the adjournment for the Whitsun holidays; and in the course of that debate the right hon. Gentleman made a long and able speech and the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean also made an important contribution to the debate, stating at the same time, I think, that the Motion standing in the name of the right hon. Member for Berwick was quite out of date. If it was quite out of date five weeks ago it is still more out of date now. Then I offered a day. I pointed out to the House that it would be highly inconvenient to give a day in the first week after the reassembling of the House, and I suggested a day in the second week for the vote of censure. Well, Sir, that offer was gladly accepted by right hon. Gentlemen opposite, but for quite a different vote of censure—a Motion on a wholly alien subject—and the right hon. Baronet's Resolution has slept from that day to this. I venture to point out to the House the extreme inconvenience of the course now taken by the right hon. Gentleman. We cannot have this vote of censure in any case for a fortnight, because by the Sessional Orders of the House the time is occupied either with Supply or with the Aliens Bill. [OPPOSITION cries of "Friday" and "Wednesday evening."] Do right hon. Gentlemen seriously mean that a vote of censure is to cover no more ground than can be covered in a morning sitting or half a day? There is another point. The right hon. Gentleman was present just now when I was bombarded by hon. Gentlemen opposite representing various interests and views with Questions pressing me to take this or that Bill—the Unemployed Bill, the Workmen's Compensation Bill, the Butter Bill, and others. There is also a Bill in which the right hon. Gentleman and his Scottish friends, as well as Scottish Members on this side of the House, are deeply interested—a Bill which is really of the greatest importance, and the fate of which is now trembling in the balance from the matter of time. Surely it would be a great mistake for us to devote to this well-worn theme, on which we have had such endless debates, the time that might be spent on legislation which is so ardently desired, especially when, as I would recall to the right hon. Gentleman, there is an occasion when the subject of the vote of censure may be debated with all the appropriate pomp and circumstance, namely, the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. The rejection of that Bill amounts to a vote of censure, and the whole day can be devoted to the discussion. Therefore, I earnestly press upon the right hon. Gentleman that, having regard to the wholly peculiar and unexampled history of this Motion, he may consent to defer till then the discussion of it.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I suppose I am to understand as the result of all this that the day is refused.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: At any rate the Motion cannot be taken for a fortnight.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I presume that in the course of that fortnight no new matter will be introduced which the House has not yet dealt with, and which the House has not yet sanctioned. Here is a day which had been promised. The Motion has been prevented from being brought on first of all by the illness of the right hon. Gentleman, and then by the immediate urgency of the Butler Report question, which obviously took precedence of any such question; and now, the matter referred to in the Motion having received some significant and vital developments, when we ask that the promise may be redeemed the right hon. Gentleman says he cannot give a day in the next fortnight. But the right hon. Gentleman is, I understand, going to deal with the question of redistribution, with which he has no authority to deal, no explicit and no inferred authority, because the country, whenever it gets a chance, shows that it does not wish to have any more of his Government. Therefore the right hon. Gentleman actually expects the House and the country to remain content when he puts off a promise that he himself has given on the ground that all the time is occupied, and then proceeds to occupy the time that might be given to this Motion by doing something that he has not been asked or authorised to do. That is how the matter stands.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is how the matter does not stand. The right hon. Gentleman has, I regret to say, used words which convey the meaning that I have refused to fulfil a pledge. That is not the fact. I originally offered a Monday. Hon. Gentlemen opposite would not take that. Then the matter was deferred until the Tuesday when, I regret to say, I was unable to be present. Then I offered the next convenient day, and that was refused by hon. Gentlemen, and another vote of censure was interpolated. Is not that redeeming a pledge? It is not as if there is the smallest attempt to burke the discussion, for I suggest that there is a fitting opportunity when the whole question can be discussed and a vote taken on it.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): No, no! Mr. Speaker has ruled frequently that it would not be competent on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill to raise the fiscal question, as it has nothing to do with the Estimates.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman is right in that I have nothing more to say. But surely that can only be because the fiscal question has nothing to do with the work of the session and has no immediate or pressing interest for this Parliament. But, however that may be, the fact remains that there is not a whole day available for a fortnight. It does not exist. It is not a question of ousting the vote of censure for other subjects. There are, no doubt, morning sittings which I hope to allocate to other business; but there are no whole days; and that is a fact that cannot be got over.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): The right hon. Gentleman has not yet given a plain and intelligible Answer. Does he mean to give a day, and does he mean to abstain during that fortnight from introducing a new Reform Bill into the House?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As to introducing a new Reform Bill, I do not propose to take the Redistribution Resolutions on a whole day, because there is not a whole day available. But I do propose distinctly to introduce those Resolutions. [Cries of "When?"] It will not be in the course of the present week. Then the right hon. Gentlemen asks whether I will give a day for the vote of censure after that. My view, when I came down to the House, not having had long notice of the Question, was that the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill would be an appropriate occasion. But I understand that there is some doubt about it. I must inquire. If it cannot be taken on the Appropriation Bill I shall not take on myself the responsibility of preventing a discussion of the subject-matter. But I must express my very great regret that one of the remaining days of the session, which might be much more usefully employed, should be taken up with these rather vague and empty debates.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman said that he should take the Redistribution Resolutions on a half day. Does he expect to get them——

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, no.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Only introduce them?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: When does the right hon. Gentleman intend to introduce these Resolutions? I think we ought to have the longest possible notice.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope to begin the discussion—which I do not for a moment imagine will terminate in one or even in two morning sittings—on Tuesday week.

Mr. PIRIE: Is it a matter of necessity that the session should end on a certain day?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no doubt that the hon. Gentleman wants to get away on that day.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What business will be taken on Wednesday and Friday of this week?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: On Wednesday morning the adjourned debate on the Second Reading of the Scotch Church Bill will be taken; the Report of Navy Supply on Wednesday evening; and I hope to take the Scottish Education Bill on Friday.

Mr. BLACK (Banffshire) suggested that the Committee stage of the Church Bill rather than the Education Bill should be taken on Friday.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that the Lord-Advocate had to put on the Paper Amendments of great importance carrying out the proposals which he stated in his speech on the Second Reading of the Bill. That could not be done until Thursday morning. He felt sure that the House would object to such rapidity of procedure, but if the House were content with the short notice of these Amendments he would put the Church Bill down on Friday.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he had had no opportunity of consulting the Scotch Members on the subject, but he knew of their desire to get on with the Church Bill. However, perhaps it would be better not to determine the question that day.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE suggested that, as the Scotch Members did not appear to agree as to which of the Scotch Bills should be proceeded with, both Bills should be withdrawn in favour of the Unemployed Bill.

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) pointed out that if the discussion were taken on Friday, they would not have any knowledge of the opinion in Scotland on the Lord-Advocate's Amendments.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I will do my best to meet the wishes of hon. Members generally. I cannot now determine the point.

General LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) asked whether on Thursday next, when the Volunteer Vote was to be taken, the Secretary for War would have sufficient time to make a general statement on the efficiency of the Army under the new scheme.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: My right hon. friend is very anxious to make that statement, but I do not know whether there will be time left for it on Thursday.

*Colonel LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square) suggested that the War Office Vote should be taken first on Wednesday evening to allow time for the statement.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that the order of Supply was arranged in accordance with the wishes of the Leader of the

Opposition. It was, therefore, to that right hon. Gentleman, who had made a specific request with all the facts before him, that the Question should be addressed.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) asked if it was intended to proceed with the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill. The Standing Committee on Law was to be summoned for Thursday to deal with it.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he tried the other night to get the order discharged but was unsuccessful. He would move again that day.

Later,

COLONEL LOCKWOOD moved that the order for the committal of the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill to the Standing Committee on Law [April 7th] be discharged and the Bill withdrawn. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."]

***MR. SPEAKER**: As there is objection to the Motion it cannot be taken now.

TOWN TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported, from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 236.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 236.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 265.]

CANALS (No. 2) BILL.

Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Canals (No. 2) Bill, with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure:—Mr Higham and Mr. Joyce; and had appointed in substitution:—Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Jordan.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT (1868) AMENDMENT (VINCENT SQUARE) BILL.

"To amend The Public Schools Act, 1868, so far as it affects Vincent Square, Westminster," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, Mr. Benn, Mr. Burns, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Lough, Mr. Louis Sinclair, Mr. Cust, and Mr. Cohen; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, July 25th, and to be printed. [Bill 266.]

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT RESTRICTION BILL.

"To restrict the punishment of whipping to the cases of male offenders under the age of sixteen years," presented by Mr. Lloyd Morgan; supported by Mr. H. D. Greene, Mr. John Burns, and Mr. Abel Thomas; to read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 267.]

ALIENS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N. R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 23, to leave out from the word 'if,' to the end of the line, and insert the words 'it can be shown that he has not in his possession or is not in a.' "—(*Mr. Bright.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 198; Noes, 126. (Division List No. 254.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allbusen, Augustus Henry E.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold,Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn.A.J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGerald W(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bingham, Lord
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Bull, William James
Campbell, RtHnJ.A.(Glasgow)
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim, S
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, RtHn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt Hn. A. Akers-
Dyke, RtHn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hn. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, RtHn.Ailwyn Edwd.
Fergusson, Rt.Hn. SirJ(Man'cr
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Sir R.B(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs
Firbank, Sir Joesph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn.JE(Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon,Maj.Evans(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George J.
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hn. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Marqof (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, Sir Jas. (Staffords. N.W
Heaton, John Henniker
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, JF(Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. Jas. Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herb. Merton
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn.ColW.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End
Lee, Arthur H(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, RtHn. Walter (Bristol,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Kananel
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Col Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G.(Stopford
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, SirH.(Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, HC(North'mbTyneside
Smith, RtHnJ Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W.F.D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edwd. Jas(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Vincent, ColSirC.EH(Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. HnSir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col.ACE.(Taunton)
Welby, Sir Chas. GE (Notts.)
Wharton, RtHn John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)

Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Si Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork N.E
Allen, Charles P.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, NE(York.NR.Whitby
Buxton, Sydney Chas. (Poplar
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter(Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, CaptEC.(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Grant, Corrie
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hutchinson, Dr Chas. Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hn. J. (Montrose)
Murphy, John
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Reddy, R.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.JEB (Isle of Wight)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Bright and Mr. Dalziel.

Lord HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said the Amendment which stood in his name was an Amendment designed to make the language of this sub-section rather more clear. The effect of the words which he proposed to insert would be to direct the attention of the immigration board to what was really the object of the sub-section, namely, the exclusion of those who were likely to become chargeable to Poor Law relief. The words of the sub-section as they stood were not clear, they were rather ambiguous, and a good many different interpretations could be placed upon the words "is in a position to obtain the means of decently supporting himself." He was not sure that it could not be interpreted in the way that a man who came upon the poor rate was in a position to obtain the means of decently supporting himself, and it was hardly for those who provided the workhouses to controvert it. He desired to make the words of the sub-section clear the other way. The immigration board might take a very strict view and exclude a great many persons who were not paupers or ever likely to become chargeable on the poor rates. He wanted to amend the clause in the sense in which it was intended to operate, namely, to prevent the influx of pauper aliens. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 24, after the word 'position' to insert the words 'without recourse to poor relief.'"—(*Lord Hugh Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said he could not agree that the words of the clause as it at present stood were not clear. He could not accept the suggestion of the noble Lord that a person by claiming Poor Law relief was in a position to obtain the means of decently supporting himself. He could not for a moment accept that as a proper interpretation of the clause. An immigrant had to show that he had the means of decently supporting himself and his family, and he could not satisfy that test if he could not show that he could support himself under reasonably satisfactory conditions. He thought it would be a very undesirable thing to say that these men satisfied that test so long as they did not come on the Poor Law.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the words of the clause were vague, and that they were so was shown from the fact that they had received entirely different interpretations from those who supported the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman the present Chief Secretary for Ireland had stated that the Bill was to protect the British working man against competition, but the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary had constantly taken the other view. In reply to Questions the Home Secretary had declared that the fact of having work to come to would be sufficient, but it could not be forgotten that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had declared that the whole action of the supporters of the Bill was based on the protection of the British working man against the competition of underpaid aliens, and while such views were put forward it could not be said that there was no vagueness.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said the clause was undoubtedly extremely vague, and the proposed Amendment would make it more definite by indicating the proper interpretation to those who would have to administer the Bill. The desire was to exclude these men, not simply because they were poor but because they were likely to become a charge upon the rates. The great argument of prominent supporters of the Bill was that our present system permitted persons to enter the country who within a very short period became a burden on the rates. It was only reasonable that such people should be excluded, but it was not reasonable to ask the House to exclude a Garibaldi simply because he had not the means of maintaining himself according to the notion of what an immigration officer considered decently. The true test was whether or not a man was likely to become a charge on the rates; if he was, that was a fair reason for his exclusion. Therefore, the Amendment would introduce a definition which the clause at present sadly needed, and he was surprised that the Attorney-General should oppose it. The new suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman that there should be a kind of margin of capacity to maintain himself beyond which the would-be immigrant must be put before he was admitted, embodied a most dangerous doctrine. It would be much better to have something definite in the clause.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) asked whether the words were intended to exclude a man who arrived possibly with little or no money in his pocket, but possessing strong arms, vigorous hands and fingers, good health, and experience for work. Trained artificers might come from France, Germany or Poland; would such men be excluded simply because they had not, say, £5 in their pockets?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY thought that, ordinarily speaking, in such cases the men would have every prospect of getting employment, and would be in a position decently to maintain themselves.

*MR. LYELL (Dorsetshire, E.) said that while the Amendment was an improvement to the clause, it could be regarded only as a verbal improvement, as the whole clause was inevitably bound to become a dead letter. An immigration officer would have no means of telling whether or not the money a man possessed had been borrowed. Before a man landed in the United States he had to show that he possessed thirty dollars; but there was a regular system under which persons desirous of going to the United States wrote to a certain agency by whom the thirty dollars were advanced, and then the immigration officer having been passed, the loan was repaid with perhaps a couple of dollars added. Even men whom the agency would not trust with the thirty dollars managed to get through, as they were met at the pier head by a Party official who advanced the necessary funds, and by that means bought the votes of the immigrants for the remainder of their lives. There was no possible means by which such practices could be frustrated, and therefore the clause was bound to become a dead letter, a result which they on that side would not regret, seeing that the clause embodied the distasteful principle that a man should be excluded solely on the ground of poverty.

*MR. MARKS (Kent, Thanet) said the thirty dollars illustration did not apply to this Bill, as there was no provision whatever as to the matter of money. The question was one not of money but of capacity and opportunity on the part of the immigrant to support himself decently. The Amendment, instead of making the clause clearer, would confuse it. Under the present wording an immigrant was undesirable if he could not show that he had in his possession, or was in a position to obtain, the means of decently supporting himself. If he had recourse to poor relief, he would not be supporting himself, and therefore the words "without recourse to poor relief" were really unnecessary. But the idea was not simply to exclude men who were likely to come on the rates. There was another condition which made them undesirable. It was not that they themselves were likely to come on the rates, but that they were likely to, and frequently did, drive others on to the rates. This was an evil that was constantly happening; destitute people came over here from foreign lands in such conditions that they were compelled to do work in the unskilled labour market at starvation prices, with the result that other men were driven from the work and had frequently to have recourse to the rates. Recent statistics of the steady rise of pauperism bore eloquent testimony on this point and——

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is hardly relevant to the present Amendment.

*MR. MARKS said he would take another point. The regulations proposed in the clause under discussion might be a new departure so far as this country was concerned, but they were not a new departure in other countries. Great Britain was practically the only country in the world which had not made regulations for the restriction of pauper immigration. Such restrictions and regulations had existed for years in the chief Continental countries. They already existed in Austria, Bavaria, Belgium——

THE CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. Member to keep closely to the Amendment before the Committee. It is a very definite and specific one.

*MR. MARKS said he was endeavouring to show that the Amendment would weaken the provision of the Bill, a provision which existed and worked satisfactorily in other countries. It was the very existence of this provision in other countries which imposed upon this country the necessity of making the regulation now proposed. It was because other countries such as France, Germany, and Switzerland refused to take this undesirable class of immigrant that the burden which they refused to assume was imposed upon us, and made this provision essential. He hoped the Amendment would be rejected.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight) said that if the Home Secretary was sincere in saying he had no desire to keep out men simply because they were poor, there could be no bar to the acceptance of this Amendment. The speech just delivered conclusively proved that there was a very real danger of misunderstanding unless some such words were inserted. The action of the Government in leaving the matter to be decided absolutely by a bureaucratic body nominated by the Home Secretary rendered an exact definition imperatively necessary. Under the clause as it stood it would be possible to exclude all competing labour——

*Mr. MARKS: Not all.

Major SEELY: If it be sufficiently poor. If the hon. Member does not mean that——

*Mr. MARKS: I mean exactly what I said, viz., that there is a certain class of unskilled labour which comes into this country under conditions so distressful that it is obliged to accept any sort of starvation wage in the labour market.

Major SEELY: This clause may make the Bill have a protective operation.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): No, no.

Major SEELY: If the right hon. Gentleman does not agree, why not accept the noble Lord's words or else make a clear statement of what is meant by the Government?

Mr. CHURCHILL (Oldham) protested against the Government not expressing their opinion upon this Amendment. The Attorney-General could very well deal with the legal aspect of the Bill, but they were now dealing with the political aspect of it. The question was whether the clause would keep out undesirable immigrants or whether it was of a protective character. The Home Secretary was the political official in charge of the Bill, and he ought to tell the House why he refused to accept an Amendment which made it clear that there was no protective intention, or whether he studiously wished to leave it vague in order to favour those who had protective designs.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said that as the hon. Member for Oldham was anxious to know whether his views were the same as those of the Attorney-General he was perfectly willing to give his opinion. He had not risen before because he thought it was hardly worth while for two members of the Government to repeat the same arguments, when they happened to hold the same views. Their object was to keep out undesirable aliens and not the other object which had been attributed to them. He did not think the words in the Bill were open to the charge of being vague or that they would be unworkable. The Government were of opinion that those words would carry out their object.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 145; Noes, 203. (Division List No. 255.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,NE.
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Austin, Sir John
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,N E(York,NR,Whitby
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas.Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M(Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, CaptEC(SAndrw'sB'ghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Grant, Corrie
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.

Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex (Donegal, W)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, RtHn. John (Montrose
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J(Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Reddy, M.
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, RtHnCR(Northants)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Chas. Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred. W.(NorfolkMid.
Wilson, Henry J (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Winston Churchill and Major Seely.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Bagot, Capt Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alex.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn AJ (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C.B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R(Christch.
Banbury, Sir Fredk. George
Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt.HnJA(Glasgow)
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J(Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn JA(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, RtHnAilwynEdward
Fergusson, RtHn SirJ (Manc'r)
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Sir R.B(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn J E (Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, MajEvans(T'rH'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond(Cambs)
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Sir Jas. (StaffordsNW
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, JF (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Kenyon, Hn. Geo T (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt Hn Col W.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, Hn H.LW.(Mile End)
Lee, ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn. Walter(Bristol,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft
Lucas, ReginaldJ(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming

Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rollit, Sir Abert Kaye
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, HC(North'mbTyneside
Smith, RtHnJParker (Lanarks
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, RtHn.Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Vincent, Col Sir CEH(Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.Col. A.C.E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton undLyne
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) moved to leave out the word "decently" in Sub-section (a) providing that an alien immigrant should be considered undesirable "if he cannot show that he has in his possession, or is in a position to obtain, the means of decently supporting himself and his dependents." The Amendment was a simple one. The clause as at present drafted made it imperative for a man coming into this country to show that he had the means to maintain himself and his dependents decently, otherwise he was liable to be refused admission. His contention was that the word "decently" was too ambiguous to put into an Act of Parliament, and especially was it so in this instance, because the word was not to be interpreted by a Court of law. It had in this case to be interpreted by the immigration officer, or, in the case of a dispute, by the immigration board. At certain ports a man might be able to come in with a much smaller sum than at other ports. There was no standard of living fixed in the Bill at all. A man with a wage of thirty shillings a week, if he had a careful and thrifty wife and if he was a sober individual, might be able to support himself, his wife, and three or four children, but again, another man with the same wage and only one or two children, if he was a dissolute character, could not maintain his family decently. Perhaps the Home Secretary would be good enough to give the House an idea of what the word "decently" meant in regard to a man maintaining himself and his family. It was practically impossible to say what was decently maintaining oneself. Some men spent little and yet maintained themselves decently, and some, again, spent large sums of money and yet never had a decent home for themselves.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 24, to leave out the word 'decently.'"—(*Mr. Levy.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'decently' out stand part of the clause."

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said the Government could not possibly agree to leave out the word "decently" because they attached very great importance to it. The hon. Member had drawn a distinction between a working man who on coming here would be able, with the capable management of a frugal wife, to keep himself on a low sum of money, and another who, under other circumstances, could not support himself and family on a like sum. That, of course, would be true, but what they wanted to do by retaining the word "decently" was to assure themselves that a man would not come here who was just able to maintain himself and family and be able to scrape through without living at all decently or living up to the standard required in this country. A great many aliens came in this condition already, and it was to this fact that a very large amount of overcrowding and sweating was clearly due. What they were anxious to do was to provide that aliens coming into the country should not be considered desirable and should not be able to pass the barrier unless they could show that they could do more than simply keep body and soul together. It would be impossible to lay down any actual money test. They knew what the money test was in America. What the aliens would have to show to the immigration officer was that there was a prospect of their being able to maintain themselves in a decent condition — to live under satisfactory sanitary conditions — and that they would be able to continue to do so. This question had been partly debated on other Amendments, and he had stated his own view that if an alien came here having the offer of employment with decent wages that in itself would in all probability be accepted by the immigration officer as satisfactory proof that the man would be able to live in this country under conditions which would be sanitary. If the word "decently" were omitted they would simply be adding to the difficulty they now had in the East End of London by allowing a large number of men to come in who were barely able to keep body and soul together, and who, therefore, could not live under the sanitary conditions which were desired.

Mr. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid.) said the Home Secretary had made confusion worse confounded. The definition asked for by the hon. Member was what was meant by the word decently. The Home Secretary had never touched it, and had left matters more complicated than they were before. Suppose he went to a port with £20 in his pocket. The immigration officer asked, "Are you in a position to maintain yourself and your dependents decently?" The most proper retort would be, "What do you mean by decently? Do you mean will I keep my home clean or do you mean that I have labour offered to me by someone who wishes to exploit my labour?" The intention of the Government had been to keep out men who would work for less wages than other people—undesirables. These men would not be asked if they would live moral lives and be law-abiding citizens. The intention was that they must also keep out the goods produced by the labour of these men on the Continent. Was that the real reason? He appealed to the Home Secretary to say what, in his opinion, was the standard he desired to maintain—a standard of money if he liked—a standard of cleanliness if he thought fit Let him give the House exactly the standard of decency so that when the immigration officer was putting the question the immigrant would know what he had to answer. It was impossible for a man with a salary of £2,000 a year to give a definition of the word decently in connection with the support of a family who lived frugally. It was no more possible for the representatives of the Government on the Front Bench to say how far a thrifty family whose income was fifteen to twenty shillings a week could make that money go. There were families brought up in decency and honour whose wages never averaged one pound per week. He thought they had a right to demand from the Home Secretary his definition of the word "decently" and what was included in it.

*Mr. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said he thought the word "decently" as applied to an alien immigrant would be best understood by a definition of "indecency," and that "indecency" would be best defined by an illustration. He thought that much which he had seen at Whitechapel was indecent. He had seen, for example, eight people living night and day in a room 12 feet square. This was indecent. It was a form of moral indecency when the charity of millionaires enabled aliens just to maintain life in a state of squalor and to compete with our own workmen and drag down and degrade their standard of life.

*MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) said that he did not think that the hon. Gentleman's argument would stand examination in view of the fact that there was a considerable amount of overcrowding elsewhere than in Whitechapel, and where the individuals were not supported by charity. The hon. Gentleman should look at St. Pancras and other parts, even of the West End of London, where aliens were not in evidence, for his definition of what was a decent standard of comfort. The Home Secretary had endeavoured to show that this Bill was workable; but it had been amply proved from that side of the House that it was unworkable. Under this Bill a man had to show that he was able to support himself and his dependents decently; but when the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the alien, he seemed to think that the alien was as child-like and bland as the right hon. Gentleman himself. What was to prevent the alien coming alone to this country, and saying he was about to earn 18s. a week? They would have to allow him to come in. But the next week, or next month, he would send for his wife, with perhaps ten or twelve children! He, and those with him, were quite willing to help in passing a Bill that would keep out diseased, criminal, or other really undesirable aliens, but this Bill would not have that effect.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE said that the hon. Member for Birmingham had described what he had seen in Whitechapel; but that was not the question. The question was, what was going to happen at an inquiry on board an immigrant ship, or at the landing place in the harbour? The hon. Gentleman had seen people overcrowded in a room in Whitechapel, but what happened in Whitechapel would not be evidence on board ship. The conditions in Whitechapel could be dealt with by the sanitary authority by a more rigorous enforcement of the sanitary laws, and not by prohibiting the entry of people at our ports. In the June number of the *Fortnightly Review* there was an article which showed that in the very worst parts of London where overcrowding prevailed, the overcrowding was not caused by aliens, but, on the contrary, by British population, and that where a Jewish population had filtered into those areas there had been a marked improvement in that respect. The publicans in those districts were exceedingly anxious that this legislation should be passed because that improvement would be affected and their trade would not consequently suffer.

*MR. LYELL said that from the speech of the Home Secretary he was sorry to hear that the right hon. Gentleman seemed to have capitulated to the protection theory held by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. Unless some sort of definition of "decently" were introduced, very much more clear and stringent than that given to the Committee by the right hon. Gentleman, there would be no difficulty in finding accommodation for these people; but there might be difficulty in finding immigration officers to undertake the job of deciding "decently" at all. He wanted to know what salary the Home Secretary proposed to give these immigration officers into whose hands such enormous powers of discretion were to be entrusted.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) said that if this clause were allowed to stand, the standard of "decently" would be left to be defined by each immigration officer according to his own view. One might take a favourable view, and another might take a harsh view. Unless a specific standard of decency was laid down in the Bill there would be an absolute want of uniformity at the ports.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland) said he wished to ask the Attorney-General whether the phrase "decently supporting himself and his dependents" meant "maintaining himself and his dependents" in a decent standard of comfort, or supporting himself and his dependents by decent means.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: In a decent standard of comfort.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL said that on those grounds a prostitute or a criminal who came into this country could not be excluded. Supposing a man arrived here and produced a set of burglar's tools, and said that he was a professional burglar, and could decently support himself and his dependents by the exercise of his profession, he could not be excluded on the ground stated in the Bill.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: That case is so likely to arise!

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: Well, take the case of a prostitute, what then?

*Mr. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) said that this was a matter of so great and vital importance that they ought to have a better definition of "decently" than had yet been given by the right hon. Gentleman. They were entitled to know what the Government standard of decency was. Was it that the man was to be morally decent or financially decent? If it were financially decent, he knew of families in this country who were able to maintain themselves decently on £1 a week and less: and he knew aliens, and others, who were not able to maintain themselves decently on £1 a day. It was clearly desirable to know by what standard of decency persons coming from abroad was to be tested.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he thought his hon. friend was entitled to some further explanation either from the Home Secretary or the Attorney-General. It seemed to be common-sense that no word should be put into an Act of Parliament unless that word was capable of definition. He undertook to say that the Prime Minister, or the Home Secretary, if he were one of the immigration officers, would not be able to define "decently" in any one of the half-dozen cases enumerated by hon. Members, and put that definition on paper. He felt very strongly, with his hon. friends, that this word "decently" should be left out. What he wanted was that the Bill should be made a workable measure, and that the least possible pressure should be placed on these unfortunate people who were brought over here, if they could show that they were able to make a living.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester E.) said he hoped the hon. Gentleman would allow him to state that he absolutely differed from him in the principle he had laid down that they must not use in the Bill a phrase which was incapable of an accurate mathematical definition. That was a statement which was absolutely and wholly contrary to common-sense; and no stronger proof had been given of that than the speech which the hon. Gentleman had just made. What the hon. Gentleman said was—"Cut out the word 'decently.' What we want is only to exclude those who will not make reasonable citizens." But what was a reasonable citizen? Silence, of course! The truth was that the hon. Gentleman himself showed how wholly absurd was the demand which he made. Two hon. Gentlemen, to whom he always listened with the greatest respect—the hon Member for Durham and the hon. Member for Wansbeck—both made the same point. They said that this word "decently" should not be in the Bill because it was incapable of definition. They stated that they knew people who could live decently upon £1 a week or less; but then they knew what "decently" meant. They had a very clear and practical working idea in their minds as to what "decently" meant. Was not that an illuminating reason why the immigration officer should have a practical knowledge of what "decently" meant? It was clear that if they were to make this Bill carry out its objects they must endeavour to secure that immigrants who would lower the standard of living in this country should be excluded. But there might be cases in which an immigration officer might admit a person who would lower the standard; and also cases in which he might refuse admission to persons who would not lower it. The broad directions given to the immigration officer would allow him to carry out the object of the Bill; and he rejected as altogether unworthy of this country that the word should be rejected.

MR. JOHN WILSON said he thought the Prime Minister had lost sight of the fact which would cause great confusion in the Law Courts if an immigrant had to appeal against the decision of the immigration officer. The right hon. Gentleman had made it quite clear that even the House of Commons could not give a clear definition of what the word meant, and thus it would afford the lawyers a pretext for long discussions in the Courts. He thought the Attorney-General ought to attempt to give them some definition. The Prime Minister, finding himself in a dilemma, threw the onus of defining the word on the Opposition, but if he would change places with them they would willingly undertake the responsibility of defining it.

MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.) said it was not a question of living on £1 a week, or whether the immigrant was thrifty and brought with him a wife who could assist him. It was a question whether he would be able to earn wages to enable him to live decently; and that was a matter which the immigration officer ought to decide.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said that if the test were to be that aliens should be able to support themselves, it strengthened it to say that they should decently support themselves.

*MR. FENWICK said that the Bill would admit men under a labour contract; and he, therefore, objected to the rate of wages as the test in the matter.

Question put, and negatived.

MR. KEIR HARDIE moved an Amendment, in order to include within the category of undesirables under the Act such men as are "brought into this country under contract or to take the place of workmen during a trade dispute." He was quite conscious of the fact that the hard and fast line laid down in this Amendment with regard to contracts would require modification if the Amendment was agreed to. They had known cases both in the United States and in the Colonies where professional singers or even preachers or lecturers going into those countries under agreements to sing or speak had been excluded because they sought to go in under contracts. The Amendment was not intended to touch cases of that kind. But if some such Amendment as this was not adopted some plan could be adopted similar to that adopted in the United States in the early days of the attempts to restrict immigration. Agents were then appointed in every European country from which the aliens came to supply contract labour. He put it to the Attorney-General whether a workman might not come to this country without a cent in his pocket, but, having a contract for employment for three, six, or twelve months, would be eligible to enter under the Bill. Chinese labourers might even be imported as they were in South Africa. They read that night that gold mines were supposed to have been discovered in Donegal. If the proprietors of those mines endeavoured to introduce Chinese labourers to develop them, it would be perfectly competent for them to do so under contract. The question of strikes was a very important consideration indeed. He could cite two cases where workmen in ironworks who were vilely underpaid—men who had not even a pound a week—were agitating for an advance of wages when a gang of Spaniards and Poles were brought in under contract by their employers, and they were threatened that unless they remained content with their existing wages, more foreigners would be introduced. They might be told that the workmen so threatened would be no worse off than they were now. He admitted that the object of this Bill was to protect British labour against undue and unfair competition by foreigners. He submitted, as a matter of fair play, that an employer should not be able to call on reserves of foreign labour, and defeat his own workmen with whom he was at war during a strike.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): Will the hon. Member tell me how the British workmen will be worse off after the passing of this Bill?

MR. KEIR HARDIE replied that the Bill proposed to give protection to underpaid British labour against the competition of foreigners. At the present time the workman knew he had no such protection, but if this Bill became law he would relatively be worse off than he was now, because he would have a nominal protection. He would be more liable to competition under the Bill than he was now. Under the Bill no poor workman could come in unless he brought a contract of employment with him, and therefore the whole machinery would be set up for importing foreign workmen under a contract of employment, and it would be easier for the employers who wanted to obtain a gang of foreign workmen to obtain them. Consequently a British workman who was being threatened with a strike or a lock-out would find his position worse under the Bill than he did at present. The Government had no right to so legislate as to give the employer an unfair advantage over his workman during a trade dispute.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, after the word 'or,' to insert the words, '(b) if he is being brought into this country under contract, or to take the place of workmen during a trade dispute.'"—(*Mr. Keir Hardie.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had listened with surprise and amazement to the hon. Gentleman—surprise because the principle upon which the hon. Gentleman's Amendment was founded was absolutely inconsistent with the arguments which had been advanced against the Bill from the same side of the House, and amazement because of the magnitude of the misunderstanding into which the hon. Gentleman had fallen as to the actual effects of the measure. The Bill had been most unjustly denounced as a protective Bill. It did not touch the question of protection one way or the other. It was simply a Bill for remedying certain well-defined evils which did a great deal of injury in the East-end of London and other parts of the country. But now the hon. Gentleman came forward and contended that the Bill failed because it was not sufficiently protective in favour of the British workman. The hon. Gentleman would keep out every alien, whether flying from a political or religious charge or not.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (interposing) said that the right hon. Gentleman had evidently not read his Amendment. Its only object was to prevent foreign workmen from being brought in under contract.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that was to say that a man who might be flying from religious or political prosecution was to be denied asylum in this country if he had made a contract with any employer of labour. The strange argument of the hon. Gentleman was due to his entire misapprehension of the effect of the Bill. The hon. Gentleman was under the delusion that if the Bill were passed in its present form it would be easier for an employer to obtain foreign indentured labour, or labour under contract, to support him in a contest with his British workmen. On the contrary, so far as the Bill had any effect one way or the other in the matter, it would make it more difficult for the employer to obtain labour from abroad. At present an employer had the completest freedom to make any contract he liked with foreign workmen and bring them in under any terms. The Bill for the first time limited the power of the employer in that respect by providing that he could only bring foreigners in on wages that would enable them to live decently. In fact, instead of any new privileges being granted to employers some of their old privileges were taken away.

MR. JOHN WILSON said it was a pity that the Prime Minister was not in the House when the Home Secretary gave his definition of what was meant by an undesirable alien. Had he been so he would not have been so definite in the statements he had made. There was one portion of this Amendment to which he saw some objection, and that was the part referring to contracts under the Contract Labour Law. If a man brought over a theatrical company or a company of artistes or singers, they being under contract were liable to be excluded from this country, which was undesirable, but he thought the Government might accept this Amendment with the words "under contract" taken out. The Prime Minister had not quite realised the position, having regard to the statement made by the Home Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman stated that if a man came to this country with a letter in his pocket showing that there was employment waiting for him he would be a desirable alien.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: What I said was that, if a man came to this country and produced evidence that he could obtain work at fair wages, I thought he would have no difficulty in getting into the country.

MR. JOHN WILSON said he had no objection to the qualification of the words, but he did not remember hearing anything about proper wages. Even leaving out of account the question of a strike, what was to prevent an employer, who wished to cut down wages, from sending letters to 100 foreigners promising them work? If those letters were to be taken as evidence of the immigrants' ability to maintain themselves, what would be the position if no rates of wages were fixed? He thought that having regard to the possibility of such men taking the place of British workmen in trade disputes the Government might very well accept the Amendment.

*MR. H. LAWSON (Tower Hamlets, Mile End) said the Prime Minister had pointed out that this Amendment would make the clause directly protective, but it was protective only of that class so well represented in this House, namely, the skilled and organised trades. There was no calling out for protection of the unskilled and unorganised workmen in the East End, from underpaid labour, but directly the skilled and organised trades were affected their spokesman called for a measure of protection which certainly had not been attempted in other respects. In one of his arguments the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil totally misrepresented the facts of the case. The hon. Gentleman said that under the Bill agents would be able to canvass for blacklegs from abroad to take the berths of men who were displaced in a trade dispute at home. But one of the worst existing evils was that the foreign steamship companies employed agents broadcast throughout Poland and Russia to obtain men for the purpose of their companies, the worst of whom were left with us. If this Bill were in operation it would act as a deterrent in that respect. There would be fewer agents and they would be less active. There was a danger of the Amendment being a handicap to the very industries for which it was desired to be protective. He could give examples to prove it. If a new process in a new trade or a new process in an old trade were developed abroad it was necessary sometimes to bring an exponent or teacher of that process to this country. That happened in regard to the stereotyping trade, of which he had personal knowledge. When plates were first cast Italians developed a peculiar skill in the process, and Italian foremen were brought to English printing houses. They did not remain, their posts having now been taken by Englishmen, but Englishmen had to be taught by Italians who came over.

AN HON. MEMBER: As immigrants?

*MR. H. LAWSON said they came under contract, and presumably might be excluded under the Amendment. If that were so it would be a great disadvantage to English trade. Although he had some sympathy with the idea, the Amendment was in terms so wide that he hoped the Committee would see that, in its present form, it was utterly unworkable.

MR. FENWICK asked what provision there was in the Bill to guarantee that men brought in from abroad under contract should be employed at such wages as would enable them decently to support themselves and their families. Was there any provision whatever enabling the authorities to insist on the payment of such wages?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE pointed out that the trades most affected in the case of a strike by the bringing in of the persons contemplated in this Amendment were the weakest and least organised trades. Such persons as those referred to by the hon. Member for Mile End, who were employed as foremen in connection with the introduction of new processes, would not be excluded, because the Amendment was confined to the persons against whom the remainder of the clause was directed, viz., steerage passengers and so forth, and these persons would not come within that category. He had voted against the Bill at every stage hitherto, and should continue to do so. He did not think a case had been made out for a measure of this kind, but if such legislation was to be enacted, it was against the class of persons at whom this Amendment was aimed that he would direct it.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) sincerely hoped that the Home Secretary, if he could not accept the Amendment as moved, would at any rate promise to introduce words to prevent contract labour from coming into this country for the purpose of pulling down the wages of British workmen.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) associated himself with the appeal to the Home Secretary to do something to prevent the bringing of people under contract into this country in such a way as to injure British workmen, and particularly to prevent the importation of foreigners during a strike.

MR. KEIR HARDIE hoped that, if the Bill was to go through, safeguards would be inserted against foreign labour being used as a means of keeping down wages or preventing their going up in this country. The provision would not keep out skilled workmen who were being brought in for a special purpose; it applied only to workmen coming in as defined by Clause 1. If employers wished to bring in persons to develop a new process they would take care to bring them in as second-class passengers by an ordinary passenger boat, and thereby remove them from the category of immigrants. Unless the spirit, at any rate, of this Amendment was accepted, the impression would be intensified that the Bill was intended merely for window-dressing purposes, and not in any way to protect British workmen against the competition of foreign labour.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) urged the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil to strike out from the Amendment the words "under contract or," so that the Committee might have a clear issue before it; and thus reveal the real object of the Bill. The Amendment would then be exceedingly simple, and it would be seen how many Members really desired to prevent undue competition with British workmen. The words "under contract" had led to very unfortunate results in our Colonies. He had, in the past, been engaged in efforts to prevent workmen from the Continent being brought to this country by unprincipled employers to compete unfairly with British workmen. If they divided the Committee upon this Amendment they would then see what amount of sincerity there was on the part of those who professed to be so seriously desirous of preventing undue competition with the British workman.

MR. KEIR HARDIE said he should be quite willing to amend his proposal by leaving out the word "or."

Amendment amended, by leaving out the word "or."

Question proposed, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

*MR. FENWICK hoped the Home Secretary would tell them what power he had under this Bill of insisting that aliens should be paid wages sufficient to enable them to decently support themselves and their dependents.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he had stated over and over again that the object of the Bill was to keep out undesirables who were likely to become a charge upon the ratepayers. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil was directly opposed to the principle of the Bill, and he could not accept it. He did not believe that such immigration as the hon. Member referred to took place, but, if it did, it would not be affected by this Bill.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 148; Noes, 215. (Division List No. 256.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,NE(York.NR,Whitby)
Buxton, Sydney Chas. (Poplar
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, CaptEC(SAndrw'sB'ghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T(Glamorgan
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Grant, Corrie,
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hammond, John
Harwood, George
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Marks, Harry Hananel
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hn J. (Montrose)
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P(Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Partick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomson, F.W.(York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk.Mid
Wilson, Henry J.(York. W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Keir Hardie and Mr. Fenwick.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.HnHughO.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J(Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt HnGeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson(King's Lynn

Mr. Akers-Douglas.

Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn JA(Glasgow)
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn JA (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Rt.Hn Ailwyn Edwd.
Fergusson, Rt.Hn Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir RB (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn JE(Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. Evans (T'r H'm'ts
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, H. D (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs)
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hn. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, Sir Jas. (Staffords. NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herb. Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.- Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
Manners, Lord Cecil
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, Wm. (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz., Sir Philip A.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Power, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H.C (North'mb Tyneside
Smith, Rt Hn J Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward J (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt.Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir CEH (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt.Hn Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col ACE (Taunton)
Welby, Sir Chas. GE. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R
Wilson-Todd, Sir WH (Yorks)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) moved to insert words to provide that an alien who was "a skilled workman in any textile or mechanical trade or industry" should not be considered an undesirable immigrant. He said he moved his Amendment for the purpose of securing from the Home Secretary an explanation which he hoped might be satisfactory of the meaning of the clause as it at present stood. The clause as it at present stood was that an immigrant should be considered undesirable if he could not show that he was in possession of, or in a position to obtain, the means of decently supporting himself. He was anxious to secure that no difficulty should be placed in the way of a man who was a skilled workman, even although he had not a penny in his pocket, and no immediate prospect of employment. He was anxious that a man should be admitted to the country quite independently of whether he had money in his possession or not. It might be the Home Secretary would say that the words "in a position to obtain the means of decently supporting himself," carried out that meaning ; and would effect that purpose ; and if that was so he should not press the Amendment. What he wanted to impress on the right hon. Gentleman was this : If this was not a protectionist measure, or if it was not put forward under the guise of a protectionist measure for English workmen, then the freest access would be given to skilled labourers who had trades or manufactures with which they could earn money in this country or elsewhere. But if it was a protectionist measure, as had been stated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, the case would be different.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, after the word 'or,' to insert the words 'is a skilled workman in any textile or mechanical trade or industry; or.'"—(*Mr. Atherley-Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said this was a matter which had been largely discussed, although not quite in the exact meaning of the Amendment which the hon. and learned Gentleman had brought forward. He had told the House not only to-day but on former occasions what he believed would be the effect of the sub-section in the case of a workman who could show that there was a prospect of his obtaining employment. He understood that the hon. and learned Gentleman wished that an alien who was a skilled workman should be considered as having a right of admission to this country, and that no question should be raised by the immigration officer as to whether he was desirable or not. He would point out that there might be objections to an alien to counterbalance the fact that he was a skilled workman. A man might be a skilled workman in some particular trade, but at the same time he might be an undesirable immigrant. Take, for instance, the case of a skilled workman who was so intemperate that he was not able to obtain employment. If there were circumstances which showed that an alien, though possessing a skilled trade, would not be able to obtain a position by which he could maintain himself and his dependents in a decent way, surely he should not be regarded as a desirable immigrant. The hon. and learned Member desired that this man should be taken out of the category of undesirables. He himself preferred the test which was provided by the Bill.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES asked whether he might take it that a protectionist character would not be given to the sub-section.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he had explained over and over again that the object of the Bill was to keep out those who might become a burden on the rates.

* **Mr. EMMOTT** (Oldham) expressed the hope that his hon. friend would not press the Amendment. He did not, however, think the Home Secretary gave a happy illustration when he mentioned the question of intemperance. Nothing would be more difficult to detect at the port of entry than whether a man was addicted to intemperance. His point against the Amendment was that he did not see why any special class should be named in the way proposed by his hon. friend. He was told by lawyers that this might have the effect of leading to different treatment of the classes not named.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS moved to insert in Sub-section (b) the words "disease or" in order to include among immigrants who should be considered undesirable those aliens who, owing to their suffering from any disease, appeared likely to become a charge upon the rates or otherwise a detriment to the public. The Amendment was necessary to provide for certain cases in regard to which there was some doubt as to whether they would be covered by the sub-section as it stood. There were some diseases which were largely introduced by aliens and which did not come within the class of infectious diseases to which the regulations of the Local Government Board applied. As a matter of fact the diseases to which the Local Government Board regulations applied were cholera, yellow fever, plague, and one or two others. The inspection under these regulations was carried out by the port sanitary officer. The port sanitary officer would tell the immigration officer what diseases the immigrants were affected with, and they would be dealt with in the ordinary way in the infectious diseases hospital at the port until they were cured, and if they had passed, in the first instance, the immigration officer, they would then be allowed to remain in this country. But if they had not passed in the first instance, then another examination would be made by the immigration officer. He thought this clause was necessary in order to cover cases which would not be covered under the regulations of the Local Government Board.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 26, after the word 'any' to insert the words 'disease or.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*__SIR FRANCIS POWELL__ (Wigan) thanked the Government for the modification which they had made in the Bill. He thought the Amendment of his right hon. friend might be safely adopted, because it was not liable to the objection which he successfully took last year to it.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES thought that this was a most proper Amendment. But still, in the arrangement the right hon. Gentleman had sketched out, there was the difficulty of the double examination of the same man. The right hon. Gentleman had not said that one medical officer was to report to the other medical officer.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said that in no case did he think that would occur. What was proposed was that the medical officer of the port authority should make the examination, and it was expected that that medical officer would in most, if not in all, cases, be the medical inspector under the Bill.

DR. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye) said he had been trying to find out what diseases had been imported into this country by aliens. There had been a great deal of exaggeration on the point. He had been in communication with the medical officer of health for the Port of London and also with the medical officer of the London County Council. The latter said that the figures generally showed that where there had been an increase of alien immigrants there had been a decrease of the death-rate and an increase of the birth-rate. Only a few cases of trachoma had been found among the aliens in the East End. There had been a steady improvement by enforcing by-laws as to sanitation in the houses let as lodgings. All the medical officers of health were alive to this subject, and the condition of the houses in Stepney was improving. The number of infectious diseases introduced into Stepney during the last few years was only six or seven; and the medical officer of health for the Whitechapel Union said that hardly any of the aliens came on the rates because the Jewish Board of Guardians relieved them in any case of distress. If these aliens got too ill to be looked after in their own homes, they were removed to the Jewish wards in the London Hospital which were kept up entirely by the Jews. He thought that in this House they ought to acknowledge the enormously good work which the Jewish community did in looking after their own poor. Nothing had struck him more in Whitechapel than the generous way in which the rich Jews looked after their poorer brethren. That was a grand lesson to Christians. The hon. Member for Liverpool had drawn a picture as to cases of lunacy introduced into Liverpool. He had made inquiry and found that during the last sixteen years there had been only fifty-four cases of alien lunacy in all the various asylums in Liverpool.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had already passed the question of lunacy, and it could not be entered upon again.

DR. HUTCHINSON said he bowed to the ruling of the Chairman; but he had been anxious to assuage the anxiety felt in regard to the difficulty of treating cases of lunacy. As to diseases generally, he believed that we exported a great many more diseased persons from this country than we imported. And it might be found that foreign Governments would try, if this Bill was passed, to play the same game with us. We exported thousands of patients every year to the Continent and had introduced to the Riviera that dreadful disease of phthisis. In that respect we could not throw stones at foreign countries. At the same time he was willing to help to carry a measure which would put a stop to infectious diseases coming into this country. The only disease which he knew of which was being introduced into this country by aliens was a sort of inflammation of the eyes, but of ninety-six cases only twenty-six were found to be infectious—which out of the thousands of aliens who came in was not a very large percentage. He understood that in the Jewish refuge in Whitechapel there was a special doctor to look after these cases.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that this was a far more serious matter than the hon. Gentleman who last spoke would have the Committee to believe. The total number of immigrants who were excluded last year on the ground of disease was 1,560.

DR. HUTCHINSON: Out of how many?

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that the total number excluded was 7,994, and out of these 1,560 on account of disease. Of those who were excluded on the frontier, before coming here, numbering 6,356, no less than 648 or 10 per cent. were excluded on the ground of disease. Now, it was very important that disease should be specifically shut out, but it did not follow that the disease should be that of a poor person. A person, however wealthy, suffering from disease ought to be shut out from this country, if possible. The hon. Gentleman who last addressed the House would have the Committee understand that very few cases of disease had been imported into this country froom abroad. In Liverpool in 1903 there were 99 cases of hightly infectious diseases landed, including 24 cases of smallpox, 22 of enteric fever, and 12 of phthisis. In 1904, there were the same number of cases of smallpox and enteric with 32 cases of measles; but in addition to those particular figures there were 581 cases of other serious diseases landed at Liverpool which required to be temporarily sent into the hospital; and every one of these cases, if this Bill had been law, would have been shut out.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that several of the diseases mentioned by the hon. Member were the very object of the regulations of the Local Government Board with which the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary said he would not interfere.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that the next Amendment standing in his name spoke for itself, and therefore, without further remark, he begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 5, after the word 'or,' to insert the words 'is an anarchist or person who believes in or advocates the overthrow by force or violence of all government or all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials, or.'"—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY pointed out that the words of the Amendment would involve an inquiry into "belief". It was not desirable to institute an inquiry in this country as to what a person believed. The inquiry must be made as to what a man had done. The Amendment could not be accepted.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD begged leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 5, after the word 'or,' to insert the words 'is a person who has been already refused admission to the United Kingdom under this Act, or.'"—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that a man might be properly excluded on one occasion, and, the circumstances having altered, might be admitted subsequently.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD moved in Clause 1, page 2, line 7, after the word "case," to insert the words "or if he is an alien who has been recently rejected by or deported from some other foreign country." It was this particular class who were the bane of Liverpool at the present moment. In 1904 there were rejected by the United States, and dumped in Liverpool, 293 males and 100 females. From Canada there were dumped ninety-six males and twenty-one females. In the first three months of 1905 the evil had become much greater. He would mention a typical case, which happened three weeks ago. A woman from Helsingfors, who had taken a ticket at Liverpool, was brought back. It was calculated she would cost the ratepayers £720 for maintenance; but that she could be sent back to Helingsfors for about £100; and that course was adopted. Why should they be the dumping-ground for other nations. These people were thrown on the quays; and the ratepayers had to support them. He, therefore, asked the Commmittee to seriously consider this very important Amendment. If any other words could be introduced which would enable them to get rid of the rejected of other countries he would not persist with his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 7, after the word 'case,' to insert the words 'or if he is an alien who has been recently rejected by or deported from some other foreign country."—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he quite understood the point of view from which his hon. friend had spoken, and which he had put before the Committee with such fairness and force. But he submitted to the Committee that it would be very undesirable that they should abdicate their right to select their own standard; and that they should reject an immigrant merely because he was rejected by another country. It would be very strange that, having set up their own test, they should apply another standard. He quite recognised that this country should not be a dumping-ground for other countries; but they should rely on the conditions they themselves prescribed.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD asked if these people would be debarred if they came within the scope of the Bill.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said, of course, in that case they would be excluded.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that these people did not return in immigrant ships.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he was afraid they could only deal with immigrant ships.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he had previously stated that this Bill was recommended to the constituencies on anti-Semitic grounds. A considerable portion of the London Press supported it on that ground; and hon. Members had received a great mass of correspondence which showed the same feeling. Although he fully admitted that that was not the object of the Government, still it was the main ground advanced in favour of the Bill by less cultivated persons outside. Nothing could have been better than the speech of the Prime Minister on this point. It was language of the highest statesmanship, if he might say so—language in which the right hon. Gentleman deplored the anti-Semitic agitation in other countries, and in which he expressed his opinion that it would be a most deplorable calamity to introduce into this country. But the question was how far this Bill would be used for that purpose by many people of less responsibility. A great many persons did desire to see an anti-Semitic use made of this Bill. The Government had made a feeble attempt to deal with this question. They proposed to add after "persecution" in line 9 the words "or punishment on religious grounds." He did not think these words covered the cases with reference to which Amendments had been put on the Paper. For example, the legal necessity for Jews in Russia to reside only in certain places would be covered by the words; but would they cover the case of Jews driven out of Russia by a police plot. He had facts in his possession; but he would not weary the Committee with the details. The matter was sufficiently well known to induce the Committee to consider it as one which they would wish to deal with. The number of Jews who fled from Russia to the United States was almost infinitely greater than the number who settled in this country. The overwhelming bulk of the movement of the Russian Jewish emigration had been to the United States, but his impression was that both to this country and to the United States the acquisition of the population had been a benefit and not a drawback. He was of opinion, and he believed the country generally was of opinion, that the religious persecutions which had disgraced the world at various times had in the past brought, incidentally, benefit to this country through the asylum we had extended to the victims of such persecutions, and he, personally, thought the present persecution of the Jewish population of Russia did this country good rather than harm. He fully admitted that a case might arise when such an emigration might take place to a country where it might be necessary to guard against the complete change of the race by the influx of a foreign population, but no such case had arisen here. If it was possible without danger to ourselves to admit the victims of such persecutions surely it was the desire of this Committee and of the country that our shores should remain open to them. Those who knew the state of the Russian Jews, knew that their state was such that they would welcome with enthusiasm, welcome as the highest attainment, as the summit of their hopes, the treatment given to the Mahomedan subjects of Russia. Fleeing to this country and to America was the only relief these people had from the horrible persecution from which they suffered, and, if the Committee could see their way to do it safely, he was sure they all desired to insert in the Bill some such Amendment as he proposed. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 9, after the words 'country,' to insert the words 'by reason of the treatment of the religious body to which he belongs or,'"—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said the Committee would appreciate that they had now embarked on a very important matter in connection with this Bill. No doubt the topic was a difficult one, and he did not know that he was in favour of the exact words of the right hon. Baronet, but they now had to consider the matter and he would like to say a few words to indicate why he should like to go as far as the right hon. Baronet had gone and why the Government Amendment did not, in his opinion, go sufficiently far. The Government Amendment only went so far as to give an asylum to a person who had been prosecuted for his religious faith and had sought the protection of this country. But if they looked at the laws actually in operation abroad, and the number of cases equivalent to a prosecution in this country, they would see that the Government Amendment was much too narrow and would not deal with the great majority of the cases. It was not a question of instituting a prosecution in Russia or Roumania or some other country and punishing a man because he had done something out of accord with the criminal law of that country, the question was supposing a man came to this country *bona fide* fleeing from what we called religious persecution were we to shut the door which had been open from time immemorial and deny him an asylum. He felt very strongly on this point and had put an Amendment on the Paper to substitute the word persecution for prosecution. Take, for example, the case of a Jew in Russia. The authorities there might say to the Jew: "If you give up your faith and become an Orthodox Christian we will give you all the advantages we now deny you." If that Jew put his religious belief before the advantages held out to him, persecution was hardly the word to describe the horrors that person would suffer. Well, the sufferer flees to this country. Were we to refuse an asylum to a person coming to us under those conditions? By so doing we should abrogate all our great traditions as a free country. He would not refer to the Huguenots because he recognised that the present conditions ? were somewhat different, but the same principle underlay the whole, and for his part he could not support any proposal which, if a person came to this country being a *bona fide* victim of religious persecution, would refuse him an asylum. He could not be a party to shutting the door against the victim of a religious persecution under those circumstances and say he should not have such a refuge.

It had been suggested that the Bill itself would to a great extent be destroyed if free entry was allowed to victims of religious persecution. In regard to that he would say, first of all, whatever the effect might be upon the Bill it would be a disgrace to this country to refuse an asylum to anyone in that position, and, secondly, he did not think it would do anything of the kind. He was strongly in favour of the general principle of this Bill because it would stop immigration to a large extent. It would stop emigration agents undertaking to land emigrants in the United Kingdom if they were refused a landing in the United States. It was quite possible to do that and still keep an asylum open for those who were the *bona fide* victims of a religious persecution. Naturally the *ipse dixit* of an immigrant would not be taken as to his being such a victim, but it would be just as easy to examine into that matter as to examine into many others. If we thought the tribunal to be instituted was not sufficiently strong and capable to draw a distinction between the victim of persecution and an ordinary undesirable alien, then he would say that the framework of the Bill was wrong, but he thought the framework of the Bill was quite sufficient to enable the question to be judged. But even if a few people came into this country in this way who were not entitled to do so, in his opinion, that would be a very small evil compared to our shutting the door to those who fled to this country as an asylum from religious persecution. Let us not at this period of our civilisation, a civilisation of which we boasted, in a Bill of this kind, give the go-by to the best traditions of our past history and refuse an asylum to a man who for the sake of his faith came to us as a person who had been persecuted for his belief. He would not prolong a discussion of this kind. It was a matter upon which they all felt deeply, and he would only appeal to the Committee not to let this country go back on its great tradition as a free country; the tradition that all who sought an asylum on the ground of their religious belief found one in this country.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that this was, perhaps, the most interesting, if not the most important, Amendment which was likely to be moved to the Bill, and he rose early in the debate in order to indicate what were the views of the Government in regard to it. The medieval treatment of the Jews was a permanent stain on European annals; and he agreed that if they could do anything to wipe it out, if they could even do anything to diminish its effects in the present time, it would be their bounden duty to do it. The right hon. Baronet had condemned the anti-Semitic spirit which disgraced a great deal of modern politics in other countries of Europe, and declared that the Jews of this country were a valuable element in the community. He was not prepared to deny either of these propositions. But he undoubtedly thought that a state of things could easily be imagined in which it would not be to the advantage of the civilisation of the country that there should be an immense body of persons who, however patriotic, able, and industrious, however much they threw themselves into the national life, still, by their own action, remained a people apart, and not merely held a religion differing from the vast majority of their fellow-countrymen, but only inter-married among themselves. He quite agreed that this country had not nearly reached the point when such a state of things became a serious national danger; but they must bear in mind that some of the undoubted evils which had fallen upon portions of the country from an alien immigration which was largely Jewish, gave those of them who, like the right hon. Baronet and himself, condemned nothing more strongly than the manifestation of the anti-Semitic spirit, some reason to fear that this country might be, at however great a distance, in danger of following the evil example set by some other countries; and, human nature being what it was, it was almost impossible to guard against so great an evil unless they took reasonable precautions to prevent what was called "the right of asylum" from being abused.

He thought the right hon. Baronet and his hon. and learned friend behind him who had supported the Amendment had fallen into an historical delusion when they said that there was an immemorial right of asylum which this country had given to all classes of victims of Continental religious persecution. He understood that at present there was a law which prevented Jesuits from coming into this country.

Colonel NOLAN (Galway, N.): There is a law against the Jesuits. It is not repealed, but it is not used.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he was quite right on the point. The truth was that the only immemorial right of asylum given by this country was to allow aliens in with whom the country agreed. He should like to ask English and Scotch Members whether they had ever studied the penal laws of Ireland. During the time the Puritans had control of the legislation of this country, say for a hundred years from the beginning of the Long Parliament, it was on religious grounds largely that the Irish Roman Catholics were persecuted, with the result that an enormous number of Irishmen, driven from their own country by religious persecution, sought refuge in other countries, to which they rendered brilliant and distinguished services.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Yes, and Scotchmen, too.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR.: Precisely. That only extended the force of his argument. Then where was this immemorial right of asylum which this country gave to the persecuted? This country, even in relatively recent times, instead of welcoming to its shores those who differed from it in matters of religion, drove forth from its shores those who differed from it in matters of religion. Did the right hon. Baronet regard the Irishmen who emigrated before the Catholic emancipation as flying from religious persecution? What was the condition of the Irish Roman Catholic subject before 1829? He had all the privileges of a British subject, but he could not enter Parliament. Did the right hon. Baronet regard that as religious persecution?

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: Yes, but for other circumstances, not that one particularly.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: What other circumstances?

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): He could not keep a horse worth £5.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: There are worse things than not being able to keep a horse. Let the House put aside this fancy picture that from time immemorial this country had been so much in favour of religious equality and the rights of conscience that it gave an asylum to the religiously persecuted of all nations, for it had no historical basis in fact. The much quoted case of the Huguenots only meant this—that we had just been at war with Louis XIV., and were about to go to war with him again, and that there was a body of his subjects who disagreed with him and agreed with us whom we welcomed with open arms. That kind of policy this country always had had, and it did not mean any high standard of civilisation or any broad views of the rights of conscience.

But, to come to the Amendment, he would ask to what extent would the clause, as it stood, keep out those who were suffering in any true sense from religious persecution. Let the House remember that the great mass of alien immigrants was not touched by the Bill at all. Those who were kept out were but a small number, and they were kept out solely because they were likely to become a burden upon the country if they were allowed in. Did the House really think that the destitute victims of religious persecution, especially Jews, would not find among their co-religionists sufficient assistance to enable them to belong to that large class of immigrants who could come in instead of to the small class that might be kept out? Probably of all religious communities the Jewish community had proved itself to be the most devoted and most profusely liberal in providing for the destitute of its own body. The right hon. Baronet had said that of all countries in the world the United States of America had proved a harbour of refuge to the largest number of those persons; but he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the United States had really no law such as he proposed in his Amendment. They had placed restriction upon restriction on the immigration of undesirable aliens, but still there was nothing in what they had done which could in the smallest degree prevent the United States being the asylum of oppressed Jews from the East of Europe.

He would make two further observations. The first was that it was useless passing a Bill of this kind unless they made it a practical way of dealing with the situation. If they so drew their regulations that it would be impossible for the officers at the various ports really to exclude those whom it was intended to exclude, then it was unnecessary labour on their part to pass the Bill. If they put in an exception depending on facts which it would be practically impossible to disprove within the knowledge of the immigration officer—if they made the exception so wide, then no one would be excluded who wished to come in and who was prepared to make a statement at variance with the truth. That was an argument that ought to appeal to the House, which was of opinion, as expressed by a large majority at the Second Reading, that a Bill of the kind should be passed. There was a further consideration which seemed to him to be absolutely overwhelming. The case on the other side put by his right hon. friend opposite, and his learned friend behind him, was this—that the freedom-loving, tolerant country of Great Britain and Ireland should welcome immigrants who had suffered either from religious or political persecution, and should welcome at the public charge any cost which those unfortunate victims of foreign oppression might inflict upon them. If that argument was advanced, he must say honestly, after due consideration of all the facts of the case, did it not occur to the right hon. Gentleman or to his hon. and learned friend that that which was to be an act of national self-sacrifice in the interests of the persecuted should be a sacrifice paid for by the nation?

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the remedy?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Were they going to have a charitable Vote for the victims of foreign persecution? They might have a collection in the churches, as had been recommended. Why was Stepney to be sacrificed because Britain owed an obligation? Obviously, if they thought this a national obligation they should make it a national burden. But no Chancellor of the Exchequer could seriously be asked to make the provision to which these fine sentiments inevitably and logically led. If they would remember the burden which was without doubt thrown upon certain districts in the country in supporting these pauper immigrants, and if they thought that any burden should be borne, and any sacrifice undergone rather than that one persecuted individual should be kept from these shores, they had no alternative but to devise some plan by which the national Exchequer should be made responsible for what, all must admit, were a most unhappy and unfortunate class—a class, however, for whom, he must frankly admit to the House, he did not consider that, either by tradition or for any other reason, we were bound as a nation to provide an unlimited asylum by unlimited sacrifice.

MR. STUART SAMUEL said he thought the country would read the Prime Minister's speech with a deep feeling of astonishment and sorrow. At one fell swoop the Prime Minister had attempted to snatch from this country the reputation for freedom and as an asylum against persecution on which it had always prided itself. The Prime Minister had attached to the people of this country the *role* of religious persecutors. The day had passed for that.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Gentleman distinctly misunderstood him. The two hon. Members who preceded him both talked of the immemorial right of asylum based on religious equality and freedom; and he had pointed out that that had no historic foundation whatever.

MR. STUART SAMUEL said he could not agree with the Prime Minister in that argument.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that it was not present to-day, but it was present 150 years ago.

MR. STUART SAMUEL said that the action which the Prime Minister proposed to take to-day was the same taken 150 years ago.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the action to which he called attention was the action by which certain persons were driven out of this country by religious persecution.

MR. STUART SAMUEL said he failed to see the difference. The right hon. Gentleman had laid it down that we were bound by our historical past to refuse admission to the victims of religious persecution upon the ground that to admit them would cost this country a certain sum of money. That sordid and unworthy argument he believed the people of this country would not approve of. His answer to one specific point put forward by the Prime Minister was that the poor Jews in Stepney were not a charge upon Stepney in any way whatever. The members of their own community did not let them come upon the rates, and so long, therefore, they could not be said to be a charge on the country, and the argument condoning religious persecution abroad on the ground that it would cost this country money disappeared at once. He went further and said that those who condoned persecution on the part of others participated equally in the wrong-doing. And they could not draw the line at the Jew. If they once admitted the argument they must apply it to the Catholic and the Dissenter, and to every other form of religion that was not the dominant religion of the country. The right hon. Gentleman had alluded to legislation in the past. The reason why the legislation of the past was not put in force to-day was that this country was ashamed of it; and it would be a sad day when the principles the Prime Minister had enunciated in this House should be those of the representatives of the majority of the people of this country. If the right hon. Gentleman thought that he represented the opinions of the people of this country, why did he not appeal to them in that case? The right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that up and down the country the people were in favour of religious freedom.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had never uttered one word in favour of religious persecution. On the contrary he had said many which showed that he was violently opposed to it.

MR. STUART SAMUEL said that if they refused asylum in this country to the victims of religious persecution and threw them back into the country where they were religiously persecuted, they were participating in the wrong. The right hon. Gentleman was not doing him justice when the right hon. Gentleman said that he was imputing to him the effects of the legislation he proposed. He could only say that his people, the Jewish community to which he belonged, were perfectly prepared to undertake the burden of supporting all Jewish aliens.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Then they will come in; they will not be kept out.

Mr. STUART SAMUEL said that the right hon. Gentleman could not argue that they were a charge upon Stepney so long as the Jewish community were prepared to support them. The right hon. Gentleman must see that the logical conclusion of his argument was that these people could not be maintained by others and at the same time be a charge upon the public purse. No figures of any authority had been produced; but, nevertheless, again and again, the right hon. Gentleman had referred to the pauperism of aliens in this country. Let them have the figures. He challenged the Government to make out any case upon their own official figures. If the figures existed they ought to be produced. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stepney said he would give figures; but no figures had yet been given which could be discussed across the floor of the House. He felt certain that the people of this country would not consent to join the right hon. Gentleman in casting back the unhappy victims of religious persecution, and he believed a certain number of hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House shared that feeling. The principles of religious freedom would make themselves felt when the present Government had gone to pieces.

***Mr. COHEN** (Islington, E.) said he would try to interpret the speech of the Prime Minister a little more accurately than the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken. He, for one, had never argued that there was a right of asylum in this country, but nobody would deny that the privilege had been accorded, and by the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants it would be with regret that that privilege would be refused. If refused at all, it would be in deference to the belief which was said to be entertained in the urgent economic necessity for such an enactment. The Prime Minister acknowledged—he was obliged to his right hon. friend for the acknowledgment—that the Jewish community did what it could to assist and maintain their own poor, and that, so far as he had any power, he could assert would be continued with the same success in the future. He earnestly asked the Committee not to abandon, for an economic consideration which could not be maintained and had hardly been alleged, the traditions, which had for centuries been the boast of England, of asylum on these shores for those whose only alleged offence was the faith they held. He thanked the Prime Minister for his condemnation of outrages inflicted on his community abroad. In that he was only following the precedent of his illustrious relative. He, himself, had a letter from the late Lord Salisbury, in which he expressed himself in indignant terms not only as regarded the outrages, but also with reference to the violation of the Treaty of Berlin, of which other Powers had been guilty. As a former president of the Jewish Board of Guardians, if there was the slightest risk, he would not say danger, which he did not for one moment believe, of an uncontrolled immigration of his community from any part of the world which would interfere with the industries of this country, he would do his best to avert it. As for the Amendment of the Home Secretary, he thanked him for it; but he did not think that the words proposed would attain the object in view. He hoped with all earnestness that words would be inserted which would render the clause wider and its effect more elastic.

***Mr. EMMOTT** said that the Prime Minister had delivered a very interesting speech. The excursus on Irish history had, however, had extremely little relevance to the actual Amendment.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

ALIENS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 9, after the word 'country' to insert the words 'by reason of the treatment of the religious body to which he belongs or'."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. EMMOTT, continuing his speech, said the Prime Minister had made a point of the fact that if we were to allow persecuted aliens to come into the country it would increase the pauper population. He had pointed out that if the case of these persecuted aliens was a matter on which the nation felt deeply the nation ought to pay for those paupers rather than that Stepney or any other parish should do so. He might remind the Committee that the number of alien paupers in proportion to population was very much smaller as regarded aliens than it was as regarded the British population, and where the alien population existed in great numbers, as they did in Stepney, then such portion of them as were paupers were largely supported by the alien population of that district who paid rates—as was the case in Stepney. In fact, it was obvious that in many districts in which aliens existed in large numbers, they must pay not only the proportion of rates which was necessary to support their own paupers, but also a considerable proportion of the rates which were necessary to support British paupers as well. And, therefore, he did think, looking on this matter broadly, that the case as regarded paupers had not been made out at all, and that that part of the argument of the Prime Minister must of necessity fall to the ground.

The Prime Minister said that if the Amendment of his right hon. friend were to be accepted, every alien immigrant pauper would say that he was a victim of religious persecution or might be the victim of religious persecution. When he heard that he could not help wondering whether the Prime Minister had looked at the Government Amendment or not. The Government Amendment, which would come on for discussion as a matter of form later, was to insert after the word "prosecution," "or punishment on religious grounds." It was obvious that if the pauper immigrants were allowed to plead as an excuse that they had come here to avoid prosecution or punishment, and solely on religious grounds, it would be perfectly possible for every pauper immigrant who came to make that an excuse just as easily as if the Amendment of his right hon. friend was carried. Besides, he ventured to maintain that it would be a far easier thing for the immigration officer to decide as to the genuineness of a plea of that kind than it would be to decide the very many difficult questions which he would have to consider under Subclauses (a) and (b) which they had already passed.

Then the Prime Minister made another suggestion. He said that he did not think that those men ought to be allowed to come as paupers. He praised the way in which the Jews had assisted their co-religionists in times of distress, and he said that this case was rather one in which the rich Jews ought to help the poor Jews, and so enable them to get out of the category of paupers, and to except themselves from this particular section. Well, if that was the case, why had the Government proposed an Amendment at all? Clearly that was not the opinion of the Government when they put down this Amendment. If it was sufficient that the rich Jews should help the poor Jews who desired to come into this country, then surely the Prime Minister's objection argued just as strongly against the Government concession as it did against the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet.

But the real question which he rose to put before the Committee was this—which of three categories of Amendments on the Paper ought they to accept? There were a great many Amendments down—most of them in different language—apparently *quot homines tot sententiae.* There was first of all the category to which the Amendment of his right hon. friend belonged; secondly, that represented by the Amendments of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich and the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stretford; and there was, thirdly, the Government Amendment. The right hon. Baronet's Amendment was the most liberal; that of the noble Lord and the hon. and learned Member for Stretford the second; and the least liberal was that of the Government. Now he wished to ask a Question with regard to the Government Amendment. What was meant in the Government Amendment by "solely to avoid prosecution or punishment on religious grounds." Would it be a proper plea for an alien immigrant to state that he had left his own country because he feared prosecution? Was that what was meant by the words "avoid prosecution," or must the prosecution actually have taken place before he could set up that as a plea to enable him to enter here? That was a somewhat important question, because if the more liberal view of that was taken—if an alien immigrant might set up the plea that he had left his own country because he feared prosecution might be coming—then of course the Government Amendment was perhaps very much more liberal than some of them had been imagining. Perhaps the Home Secretary when he spoke would be good enough to reply to that Question.

He had an alternative suggestion to make to the House. Would the Home Secretary be willing to accept the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet provided it came after the word "solely." It would restrict it a little if it read "solely by reason of the treatment of the religious body to which he belongs or to avoid prosecution for an offence of a political character." But supposing that the Home Secretary made an unfavourable reply to that suggestion, would he not take the words of the hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division rather than those of his own Amendment. They should have the word "persecution" instead of "prosecution." He was quite sure the House would agree with him that the right hon. Baronet put forward a very powerful plea on behalf of the views which he held. The argument for his Amendment as contrasted with other Amendments was that much of the worst cruelty on Jews was possible without any prosecution taking place at all. Organised attacks had been made on the Jews in many parts of Russia, which were connived at by the authorities, which were ignored by the police, and which would not make it possible for any of the victims of that kind of persecution to escape the restriction which was placed upon them under the form of the Government Amendment. He was not going to say anything about the "right of asylum." He thought historically, undoubtedly, we could not talk very much about the right of asylum, but we could talk about the "practice of asylum," and that was the real point that they wanted, as far as possible, to keep up. Because of any evil that we saw now in this country resulting from alien immigration, we did not want to think that Jews in distant parts of Europe in fear of their lives might be prevented from coming here because they feared that on arrival they would be turned back to face again the persecution which they were seeking to avoid. That was the real question; it was no vague altruism. It was no old-fashioned cosmopolitanism that members of the Opposition held in putting forward that plea. What they said was that this had been the traditional policy of this country in the past, that we had not suffered by it, that in some respects we had gained by it, and that was the policy which in regard to this question of religious persecution they desired to see continued by this country.

MR. DUKE (Plymouth) said that Members on the Government side of the House generally believed that the acceptance of this Amendment would deprive this Bill of a great deal of its practical utility. Many of them sympathised with what had been said on both sides of the House with regard to religious refugees, but they did not see their way to go so far as the hon. and learned Member for Stretford was evidently prepared to go. He, however, could not help thinking that there must be some modification of the terms of the clause which would enable the Government to meet a sentiment which found strong expression in the House and would find a powerful echo throughout the country. There might not have been a right of asylum in this country in the past, but among the masses of the people there was an honest desire that they should do nothing to deprive themselves of a source of national pride in the sense that the oppressed of other countries were able to find a refuge here. He asked the Home Secretary whether the difficulty could not be solved by some form of words which would meet the case of a Jew who was in imminent peril of his life and who came to this country penniless because he had been stripped of all the means he had possessed. Could not words be inserted which would make it a qualification to be specially considered that the refugee was in immediate danger of life or limb arising from his religious beliefs? And could not we, for the purpose of securing that benefit to such deserving persons, arrange that the guarantee of the Jewish Board of Guardians should be accepted as a sufficient security that an otherwise deserving person would not become a burden on the rates.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE said the Amendment placed on the Paper by the Home Secretary was a remarkable proof that the discussions on the Bill, short though they had been, had produced a marked effect on the minds of the Government. Had it not been for those discussions, the present Amendment which, although it did not go far enough, was nevertheless a concession, would never have been put forward. The Prime Minister himself had now admitted that the Huguenots did not arrive in this country in that state of prosperity which many people imagined, and that, as a matter of fact, some of them were in such a state of destitution that a public subscription had to be raised to help them. It was unfortunate that the right hon. Gentleman should have taken the present opportunity, if not to question the wisdom of the generous policy of the present day with regard to aliens, at any rate apparently to suggest to the Committee that he looked upon it as an open question as to whether this country should not at any moment reverse or limit those great principles of liberal admission which were supposed to have become the common property of the nation. It could not be denied that owing to the wise legislation of the last century it had at any rate become the custom of the country to admit aliens without question, and whereas before the burden of proof lay the other way, it was now cast upon those who desired to exclude aliens. The law of England in this matter now depended on the statutes of the late reign, the most recent of which, the Act of 1870, removed the last disability attaching to aliens by enabling them to own real property. Why could not the Home Secretary extend the idea of this Amendment, so that instead of dealing merely with the individual it should deal with the class? The concession had been asked for from both sides of the House, and if it were granted it would probably be the best way of making rapid progress with the Bill.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) felt so strongly that his constituents would object to the passage of the Bill if it prevented this country from continuing to be the refuge of the victims of religious persecution, that he appealed to the Prime Minister to do something to meet the generally expressed view of the House. Under the Bill, persons persecuted for their religious views would be able to obtain access to this country if they were able to come over as second-class passengers, but not if they were poor and unable to travel otherwise than in the steerage. That was surely contrary to the wishes of the Prime Minister, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to meet the difficulty, possibly on the basis suggested by the hon. Member for Plymouth. It had been shown, particularly in the case of the Jews, that provision was generally made by their co-religionists to prevent these people coming on the rates, but, even if it should result in some financial loss, he believed the general sentiment of the country would be in favour of England continuing to be a refuge for people who were persecuted for their religious views. The people who had made great financial sacrifices to rescue the slaves would certainly back up the Goverment in this matter. The granting of asylum to these people had not hitherto resulted in any damage to the interests of the country, and he sincerely hoped the Government would modify the Bill in the desired direction. He heartily supported the main lines of the measure for the exclusion of criminals and undesirables, but unless the Bill were modified on this point he would be compelled reluctantly to vote against it.

***CAPTAIN ELLICE** (St. Andrews Burghs) said he had listened to many speeches from the Prime Minister, and as a rule with great pleasure, but he had been extremely sorry to hear the address the right hon. Gentleman had delivered that night. Whatever the law might be, there was no doubt that the custom had been that those who suffered from religious or political persecution should be admitted to this country, and in the Journals of the House there was entered a protest by the Liberal Leaders of 1818 against the Aliens Bill of that day. With the permission of the House he would read one clause of that protest. It ran thus—

> "Because the Bill is cruel, for even when not perverted to any improper purposes, it may deter the victims of civil and religious persecution abroad from seeking refuge under the laws of a free country."

He hoped that that spirit would still prevail in this Assembly, and that the Government would, even now, reconsider their determination and permit some Amendment which would embody the general expression of opinion on both sides of the House.

***MAJOR EVANS GORDON** said the hon. Member for Tavistock seemed entirely to have ignored the great and wide concession the Government had already made in this matter. The Amendment of the Home Secretary went very far—in the opinion of many Members it went too far—and he hoped before the debate concluded the Attorney-General would explain what exactly the words meant. The present position was very serious. He repudiated in the strongest terms any desire to add to the burdens of the Jewish people, but when hon. Members spoke of religious persecution what did they really mean? Did they mean actual persecution such as occasionally occurred in Russia, or did they mean the normal disabilities which arose out of the administration of the Russian laws, not only to Jews, but to every subject of the Czar? Probably every person coming from Russia, whether Jew, Catholic, or member of the Orthodox Church, could with perfect justice say that according to the standards of this country he was a persecuted person, either religiously or politically. In a country where a peasant living a harmless life could not leave the village without the permission of the head man, where anybody could be imprisoned at a moment's notice on an administrative order, without trial or inquiry, where men had only to get a revolutionary leaflet put into their pocket to render them liable to imprisonment, the whole population was, from our point of view, politically or religiously persecuted, and it really meant that the Committee had to consider how far the people of this country were to be made the indirect victims of the misgovernment of foreign nations.

He differed from the hon. Member for Whitechapel as to the burden imposed upon the people. There was a burden, and the influx of these aliens into certain areas entailed great hardship upon our own people. In view of the few categories the Bill was intended to exclude, he was bound to say that after the very liberal interpretation of persecution which the Government had introduced by this Amendment, they could not go much further without wrecking the whole Bill. By giving all foreigners who were persecuted and discontented free access to this country they were undertaking a very great risk indeed. In America no such exception either for religious or political persecution was introduced into their Acts of Parliament, and it had never been complained or alleged in America that any hardship had arisen on that account, or that the American Government was reactionary or unmindful of the burdens of the Jewish people either in Russia or elsewhere. On the contrary, the Jewish community in America had protested again and again against their co-religionists being recklessly sent to the United States. There was no such provision as this in force in America, while the Jewish colonies themselves did not admit people simply because they had been the victims of persecution, but solely on the ground of their fitness as colonists. The whole of the population of Russia, according to our ideas of liberty, was a politically and religiously persecuted population, and we had to consider how far we were to be made the indirect victims of the misgovernment of foreign nations. He opposed any alteration of the Government Amendment. If any Government in Europe desired to get rid of a certain section of its population it would only be necessary, under this Amendment, to set up religious disabilities to allow of that section being sent to this country. A man might still be an undesirable alien though subjected to persecution.

As to the expulsion clause, he reminded hon. Members of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition at Limehouse, when he declared that if a man did not conform to our sanitary standard he should be sent back to the country whence he came. But among those men there would necessarily be some who came under the definition of persecuted persons. Were these to be sent away or not? If they were, then it came to this, that while to exclude a persecuted person was barbarous, to expel him after arrival was legitimate.

The hon. Member for Whitechapel had grossly misrepresented the Prime Minister's speech. The hon. Member said that those who sent back these people or supported a policy of that kind were participators in the persecution. Was it not the fact that the Jewish community spent thousands of pounds in sending back people to their homes? How, then, could it in fairness be alleged that such a policy was participating in persecution? In face of the policy pursued by the Jewish Board of Guardians so steadily for so many years with the avowed purpose of relieving the burdens which these people had caused in the East End of London, it was monstrous for the hon. Member for Whitechapel or any other hon. Member to say that those who were supporting this policy were participating in the persecution of the Jewish people.

If the Jewish community found it necessary, as they did find it necessary, year after year to send thousands back to their homes, how could it be alleged that they would be doing anything wrong or harsh and unfair by attempting to exclude this small number of undesirable people who not only inflicted an injury upon the native population, but were also a grievous burden upon the Jewish community in the East End of London and many other parts of the Metropolis.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: All those people are sent back at their own request, and none of them are victims of religious persecution.

Lord HUGH CECIL said he would very much like to hear from the Government an announcement that they would be prepared to go some way towards meeting a widely-entertained feeling on both sides of the House in favour of some further concession to secure that the Bill should not be made an instrument for increasing the hardship of those who throughout Christian Europe, with the exception of Russia, were objects of very real pity. He found some difficulty, which constantly arose in these debates, in following his hon. and gallant friend, who seemed to take quite a different view of the scope of the Bill to that taken by the Government. He quite agreed with the Prime Minister that it would be absurd to say that historically we had not been a persecuting people; but it was true that when we adopted the principle of religious liberty we did so for the whole human race, and the distinction that some people were disposed to draw—but not the Government—between our own people and foreigners was not a distinction known to English history, nor could it be defended on grounds of Christianity or reason. To say that we might exclude any aliens we chose was to enunciate a pagan doctrine difficult to reconcile with the essential part of the Christian religion that subordinated national distinctions to our moral obligations. It was no extenuation of a wrong to say it was done to a man of another nationality.

It was obvious that an oppressed person had, *prima facie*, a right to asylum, and if that right was withheld from him it must be shown that it was to prevent a greater evil. Could anything of the kind be shown in this case? He agreed with the Prime Minister that only a small class would be excluded under the Bill, and the whole scope of the Bill would not make a great difference to the country. It seemed to be overlooked that the burden of proving that he was the victim of persecution would be with the alien, he would have to satisfy the immigration board that he had been religiously oppressed and that that was the reason why he had passed the sea and come to this country. Unless he could prove that he would not get the benefit of the exemption, and surely the board could be trusted to discover the truth. Only a small number of persons would come within the exemption, for in the large number of cases friends would provide the refugee with sufficient money to take him outside the scope of the Bill altogether. It could make very little difference to the condition of things in the East End of London whether these few were or were not admitted, it would be no sensible economic factor. If they became in any considerable number chargeable to any union it would be an easy thing to relieve such union; and he was persuaded that if any community had the choice between bearing on the rates the burden of supporting the people and of sending them back to such persecution as the Jews had suffered in Russia, the community would not hesitate a moment in opening their door wide to the refugees. He would undertake to go to Stepney any day and convince the working men that that was their duty; and he was sure they would embrace it with positive enthusiasm. But they did not view this matter in its true light. What he wanted the Committee to do was to concentrate their minds on the case of an individual who had been in a scene of massacre, had lost, it might be, some of his relations, and had escaped from a place where pillage, cruelty, and all sorts of horrible acts were being perpetrated. Was he to be told that because he had not a certain property standard he was to be sent back whence he came? He was sure there was no body of Englishmen who would tolerate such a thing. Therefore, he earnestly invited the Government to adopt some remedy which would prevent this Bill from being used in a way that would be an outrage on the moral sense of every Englishman.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said the noble Lord's speech had sounded the right tone, and he was sure it would be responded to in the hearts of all the generous people of the United Kingdom. What a contrast it was to the speech they had just heard from the hon. Member for Stepney. It seemed for the time being to cut off from the hon. Member's nature every generous impulse which they believed to be characteristic of Englishmen. He was, however, not concerned so much with him as with the speech delivered that afternoon by the Prime Minister. He had had the fortune to hear that speech from beginning to end, and much as he admired the tone in which he opened, he heard many of the right hon. Gentleman's statements, first with pain, and afterwards with nothing short of disgust. The right hon. Gentleman's argument was based on two grounds. First of all, he said that the right of asylum in this country was by no means an immemorial custom, and that we at one time had been as much persecutors as were some European people at the present time. Secondly, the right hon. Gentleman stated that even if religious refugees came to this country they were to be kept out solely because they were likely to become a burden on the rates if admitted. Both these arguments were quite foreign to the people of the United Kingdom. The noble Lord had done well in choosing one particular instance. He could give the right hon. Gentleman many instances within his own knowledge of men who had been driven from Southern Russia by religious persecution, Christians as well as Jews, and had found their way to this country destitute of relations and property, men who had nothing but the clothes they were wearing, and who were bound to depend on such gratuitous generosity as they could find from the hospitable people of the United Kingdom. Were men who came under such circumstances as these to be told that they would become a charge on the rates of Stepney, and therefore we had no use for them here? The Prime Minister said we welcomed the Huguenots because we were at war with their oppressors. But the persecution from which people in Southern Russia had fled from time to time was absolutely antagonistic to the people of this country, and every sentiment which we possessed was at war with the feeling of the Russian autocracy. The philosophic hair-splitting of the right hon. Gentleman in a matter of life and death would not be accepted by the people of this country as the expression of their true and highest feelings.

*Mr. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said he wished to re-echo everything that had been said on both sides of the House that the consideration of this subject must be absolutely free of the taint of anti-Semitism, which had hitherto been happily avoided in this country. The hon. Member who last spoke had truly said this was not a Jewish question alone. A large number of aliens who came to East London were Christian Poles, and they had been, not perhaps in equal degree, but in a very similar way subjected to the same kind of treatment as those Jews who came from the same country, and it was possible that before very long we might have incursions of subjects of the Turkish Empire coming for similar reasons. He believed that on both sides of the House there was a very genuine desire that the genuine religious refugee should not be a subject of any penal enactment; but of course they had to devise words whereby there should be some test between him and those who might abuse the protection. He could not help thinking that the words of the right hon. Baronet's Amendment were much too broad, and that if they were passed it would be competent for any alien, on being refused admission to this country, to say that the state of the law in the country he came from was not as good for the members of his religion as in England, and then it would be impossible to deny him admission. On the other hand, as to the Government Amendment, he could not help thinking that the words proposed by the Home Secretary were somewhat too narrow. He thought they should find something between the two, in order to carry out the main purposes of the Bill and at the same time deal with the special case of the man who knew that if he remained in his own country his life, or at all events his safety, would be in danger. He was not a lawyer or a draftsman, but he ventured to suggest that the Government might consider the following—"Or on account of religious belief is unable to live without danger to life or limb in the place of his domicile."

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said he believed there was in every quarter of the House a real desire to arrive at a conclusion in this matter which would be satisfactory not only to the House, but to the country at large. No doubt there was no legal right of asylum here, but the traditions of this country were in favour of admitting aliens who had been subjected to religious persecution in their own countries. This question was raised on the Second Reading of the Bill, and a strong desire was expressed that some unanimous conclusion should be come to in regard to it. He believed the right hon. Baronet was not particularly wedded to the words of his Amendment. The Amendment seemed to him too broad because he used the words "treatment" and "religious body." He thought the House desired to deal rather with the individual case than with a religious body as a whole. On the other hand it appeared to him that the Government proposal was far too narrow. The Government proposal was that an individual should be allowed to come into the country if there was actually some process of law in operation against him. A person against whom there was some process of law in operation would not be allowed to leave the country at all. It was the individual who feared that a process of law would be put in operation against him in his own country who should be allowed to come in. If the Amendment of his right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean were amended in the sense suggested by the hon. and learned Member for Stretford and the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, it would meet with the unanimous acceptance of the Committee.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne) joined in the appeal for words of greater liberality in regard to this most important question. The Government seemed to think that this was not a very large question, but he would point out to the Committee that the United States had already had to deal with it, and that they had found it a much larger question than many hon. Members seemed to believe. The United States did not deal with it on sentimental but on material grounds. In other words, they looked at it from the point of view whether the immigrants were desirable or not. If the immigrants were entering the United States to come into competition with workmen there they were not admitted. An hon. Member had stated that the Jewish body were prepared to guarantee that their destitute co-religionists would not become a charge upon the Poor Law. That was a statement which demanded the serious attention of this House. They all knew that a certain section of the Jewish community possessed enormous wealth, and that such a guarantee could easily be given. But it should be remembered that the poor Jewish aliens who came into this country entered into competition with the unfortunate people in the East End of London. He would like to call the attention of the Labour Members to the fact that these aliens were not members of trades unions, and that many of them had to work fifteen hours a day for 1s. 6d.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member is getting a long way from the Amendment.

MR. RENWICK said he had no wish to travel away from the Amendment. He only wished to point out what was the effect of the competition by aliens in the East End. They had heard from the other side as to the poor rates at Stepney. The result of these conditions in the East End of London was to seriously increase the rates. He appealed to the House to cast sentiment aside and look at this question from an Imperial point of view.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not intervene in order to reply to some of the very singular attacks which had been made upon him in the course of the last two hours, although he might well have asked permission to do so. One hon. Gentleman seemed to think that he was justly open to the charge of inhumanity, and that he was indifferent to the sufferings of the Jewish race in Russia and other Eastern countries because he did not think that their rights, or indeed in any serious respect their interests, would be interfered with by the Bill. He would remind the Committee that at all events they who sat on that bench could not be regarded as indifferent to the interests of the race on behalf of whom the hon. Member for Whitechapel spoke. So far as he knew, alone among the nations of the world, and certainly alone among the Governments of this country, they had offered to the Jewish race a great tract of fertile land in one of our possessions in order that they might, if they desired it—[Ironical OPPOSITION laughter]—find an asylum from their persecutors at home. He did not know whether that offer was regarded as contemptuous or derisory, he could only say that such an offer had never yet been made by any country to the people on whose behalf the hon. Gentleman spoke.

He entirely agreed with his noble friend the Member for Greenwich that they must not regard moral questions as questions purely of a particular nation. That was a commonplace of morality which no human being could deny, but his noble friend would be the first in courtesy to admit that our primary duty was to our own countrymen, and that universal morality was not aided but hindered by diminishing the weight of the obligation to those nearest to us. It was the men who professed a universal cosmopolitanism who did least first for their family, and then for their country. He agreed that they ought to look at this from a wide standpoint, but that did not carry with it any suggestion that our obligations at home were not far more pressing than our obligations abroad. He did not read in any narrow fashion these obligations. He had put to the Committee an argument to which no speaker who followed had replied—namely, if it were a national obligation for us to relieve the persecuted immigrants from Russia, Roumania, or wherever it might be, that obligation should fall upon the nation and not upon the particular locality. No answer had been made to that.

LORD HUGH CECIL said that would be quite easy; the rates could be relieved.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said his noble friend was consistent and logical, though hon. Gentlemen opposite were consistent less often than he could desire. He largely agreed with his noble friend. He thought that if this country regarded it as its duty, in the face of some sudden persecution, or some sudden series of outrages upon an alien population, to give them an asylum, they must do it on some broad ground and let that House contribute. His noble friend agreed. [OPPOSITION cries of "We are all agreed."] That was the first suggestion he had heard of such agreement. No one during the last three or four hours had suggested that the proper way of dealing with the matter was by a Vote on the Estimates, nor was he aware that any such Vote had ever been passed.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The "Poor Palatines."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Well, there was the case of the Lisbon earthquake in 1705, which case was in his mind. This House did, it was true, contribute to mitigate the horrors consequent upon the Lisbon earthquake, but a great national calamity was not a contingency dealt with by this Amendment, which would simply throw on the ratepayers of a particular district the obligation of carrying out what it was suggested was a national responsibility. The real difficulty about this question was, after all, not the question of principle, but the difficulty of draftsmanship. There was a difficulty in the shades of difference that constituted religious or political persecution. When a man was brought up on a political or a religious charge, and given a definite punishment, the case might be clear. But by sensible modifications such cases shaded off to a point where it was almost impossible to say whether a man truly was the victim of what ought to be called religious persecution, or whether he was using the fact that his life was made rather disagreeable to him in his own country as a reason for making himself a charge upon ours. The first of those cases they thought ought to be admitted. Possibly the words of the Government were too stringent; but he was certain the words of the right hon. Gentleman were far too lax. Perhaps they might agree on some formula between the two. He would suggest the addition to the Amendment of his right hon. friend the Home Secretary of other words which would make the whole Amendment read as follows — "Solely to avoid prosecution or punishment on religious grounds, or for an offence of a political nature, or to avoid danger to life or limb on account of his religious beliefs." [OPPOSITION cries of "Persecution."] Persecution was an extremely vague term, and he thought it would be better not to use it.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) suggested that "or liberty" should be added to "life or limb."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought the term was perhaps too wide, while "persecution" was far too vague. Perhaps it would be better to use the words "or danger of imprisonment." [OPPOSITION cries of "No."]

MR. CRIPPS said that what was wanted was to avoid danger to life, limb, or liberty on account of religious belief. So far as he was concerned he believed that the words of the Prime Minister would cover substantially all the cases which the Committee desired to see covered.

MR. CHURCHILL (Oldham): No.

MR. ASQUITH said he thought the word "imprisonment" was much too narrow. There were various other forms of coercion which amounted to a very serious disability. He would suggest the words, "or persecution involving danger to life, limb, or liberty."

LORD HUGH CECIL asked if that incorporated in the Bill the doctrine against religious persecution? It seemed to him that it made it clear that we did not hold the right of asylum.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought the following terms might meet nearly everybody's views: "In order to avoid persecution involving danger of imprisonment or danger to life or limb."

***MAJOR EVANS-GORDON** said he had no objection to the word persecution; if qualified in some such way as was suggested it would satisfy him.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR; I think these words will meet the view of hon. Gentlemen opposite: "In order to avoid persecution involving danger of imprisonment or danger to life or limb." [Cries of "Why not 'liberty.'"]

***SIR CHARLES DILKE** said that if the Prime Minister had accepted the suggestion of his right hon. friend the Member for East Fife he should have at once withdrawn his Amendment, or he would have been willing to withdraw if he had accepted the suggestion of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich or that made by the hon. Member for the Stretford Division.

LORD HUGH CECIL said he did not think the difference between "imprisonment" and "liberty" was very great. He suggested that they should put in "liberty" now and consider whether they should put in "imprisonment" on the Report stage.

MR. CRIPPS thought the words of the Prime Minister would cover substantially all the cases which the Committee desired to see covered.

MR. CHURCHILL: No.

MR. CRIPPS: May I appeal to the right hon. Baronet not to press his Amendment.

***SIR CHARLES DILKE**: I certainly will not withdraw unless we get something more definite.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said the Prime Minister on his own initiative and by his own volition suggested "liberty" in the first instance. [Cries of "No."] He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman not to be influenced by certain uncharitable words which had been addressed to him, but to stick to the words "life, limb, and liberty," all of which connoted and denoted what the House on both sides were prepared to agree to without a division. He appealed to the Prime Minister to rise to the level of the occasion and let them settle this matter without a division.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should like to explain the position we are in. If this Amendment is defeated it will be after eleven o'clock, and then I cannot put any Amendment except the Government Amendments. If this matter is not settled before eleven o'clock then I must put the Amendment on the Paper and no other.

MR. ASQUITH again appealed to the Government to include the word "liberty," because "imprisonment" would not include such obvious cases as the confiscation of property.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said, as he had already pointed out, the word "liberty" would have far too wide an application.

MAJOR SEELY urged the Prime Minister to accept the word "liberty," and pointed out that any difficulties such as the objections raised to this word by the right hon. Gentleman could be settled by regulations, which in the past had been made in regard to similar matters.

MR. CLAUDE HAY, whose remarks were almost inaudible in the Press Gallery, was understood to say that he hoped the Government would not agree to any compromise upon this question, because the compromise which had been suggested would make it possible for the 5,000,000 Jews in Russia to come to this country, and become competitors with the unskilled labourers in this country. They had no right to be generous at other people's expense. [OPPOSITION cries of "Divide, divide."] Hon. Members might call out "Divide, divide," but he claimed that he had as much right to have his say upon this subject of Jewish persecution as any other hon. Member. [More interruptions and cries of "go on" and "Agreed."] The people who were oppressed ought to take their part as men in their own country in upsetting and overthrowing the misrule which oppressed them, and which was condemned by all right thinking men throughout the civilised world. [Cries of "Divide, divide."] He thought the Government should adhere to their proposal——

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, to put the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That the words 'by reason of the treatment of the religious body to which he belongs or' be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 189; Noes, 223. (Division List No. 257.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N.E. (YorkNRWhitby
Buxton, Sydney Chas. (Poplar
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir, H.
Causton Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt EC(SAndrw'sB'ghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (CavanW.
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis John Herbert
Lough Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Chas. Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway,N
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J.A. (Saffron Walden
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, MajJEB(Isle of Wight)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn.CR(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George

Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddersf'd
Younger, William
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Charles Dilke and Mr Stuart Samuel.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allsopp, Hn. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Bagot, Capt Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J(Manch'r.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T.(S thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clive, CaptainPercy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, Wm. Bromley
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn.Sir Joseph C
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hn. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, RtHnAilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn SirJ(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, SirR.B.(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, HnJE (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, MajEvans(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hn. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hn. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J F(Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col.W
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn. H.L.W(Mile End
Lee, Arthur H (Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, RtHnWalter(Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingsh.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt.Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt. Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt Hn Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire

Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, RtHn Col. Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H(Renfrew)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H (Hertford, East)
Smith, HC(North'mbTyneside
Smith, RtHnJParker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.- Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-ColA.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G.E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H. (Yorks
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

The Chairman then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the business allotted to the sitting.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 12, at the end, to insert the words, 'nor shall leave to land be withheld in the case of an immigrant who shows to the satisfaction of the immigration officer or board concerned with the case that, having taken his ticket in the United Kingdom and embarked direct therefrom for some other country immediately after a period of residence in the United Kingdom of not less than six months, he has been refused admission in that country and returned direct therefrom to a port in the United Kingdom.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to insert the words, 'and leave to land shall not be refused merely on the ground of want of means to any immigrant who satisfies the immigration officer or board concerned with the case that he was born in the United Kingdom, his father being a British subject, and that he intends to make only a temporary stay in the United Kingdom.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 17, at the end, to insert the words 'or if security is given to his satisfaction that undesirable immigrants will not be landed in the United Kingdom from those ships except for the purpose of transit.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 22, at the end to insert the words 'but an immigrant conditionally disembarked shall not be deemed to have landed so long as the conditions are complied with.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 237; Noes, 188. (Division List No. 258.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Bagot, Capt JoscelineFitzRoy

Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn. A.J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Chas (Poplar
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H.A.E.
Colston, Chas Edw H Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, RtHn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Admund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, RtHnAilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt. HnSirJ(Manc'r.
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R.B(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk
Gordon, Hn J E (Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, MajEvans(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq of L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir Jas. (Staffords, NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A(Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J F (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, RtHn. Col W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn H L W (Mile End)
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col Chas W(Evesham)
Long, RtHnWalter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis(Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneaux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson, Rt. HnColEdw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Sharpe, William Edward
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H (Renfrew
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H.C (North'mbTyneside
Smith, Rt HnJParker(Lanarks
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt Hn Lord (Lancs)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuffnell, Lieut.-Col Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col ACE(Taunton)
Welby, Sir Charles G. E(Notts
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd

Whiteley, H.(Ashton und Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W H (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N.E(York, NR, Whitby
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S Andrw'sB'ghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E.(Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir(Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P(Cavan, W
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kean, John
M‘Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P(Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J.E.B. (Isle of Wight
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C R(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Hn. Philip Jas.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)

Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, FredW(Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr Herbert Gladstone and Mr William M'Arthur.

Clause 2:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 30, to leave out the words 'landing of immigrants for the purpose of,' and insert the words 'disembarkation of immigrants for the purpose of inspection'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas*)—instead thereof.

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 33, to leave out the words 'holding of meetings of the board if convenient on an immigrant ship,' and insert the words 'place of meeting of the board.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas*)—instead thereof.

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 36, to leave out the word landed,' and insert the word 'disembarked.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas*)—instead thereof.

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 36, at the end, to insert the words 'Rules made under this section shall provide for notice being given to masters of immigrant ships and immigrants informing them of their right of appeal, and also, where leave to land is withheld in the case of any immigrant by the immigration officer, for notice being given to the immigrant and the master of the immigrant ship of the grounds on which leave has been withheld.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 237; Noes, 187. (Division List No. 259.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allsopp, Hon, George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHn.GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R.(Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Chas. (Poplar)
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, Rt. HnJA. (Worc.)
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton)
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn Thos H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cripps, Chas. Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel

Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, RtHn Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes,RtHn.AilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B.(Inv'rn'ssB'gs
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'rH'm'ts
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'donderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir Jas. (StaffordsNW
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Hozier, Hn. James H. Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert M.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt Hn Col.W.

Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn. H.L.W.(Mile End
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, RtHnWalter (Bristol,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis(EdinburghW
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingsh.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milner, Rt. Hn, Sir Fredk. G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike(Darlington)
Peel, HnWmRobt.Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.

Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt.Hn. Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col.Edw.J
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, HC(North'mbTyneside)
Smith, RtHnJParker (Lanarks
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hon, Sir Wm. H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G.E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling

Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, RtHnHerbert Henry

Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen

Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N.E(York,NRWhitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M.Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(SAndrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (LanarkNE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan,W
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex.(Donegal,W)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P(Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J.E.B. (IsleofWight
Shaw, Charles Edw (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn.CR(Northants
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull,W.)
Wilson, Fred W.(Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.
Woodhouse, SirJT(Hudd'rsfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur

Clause 3:—

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 260; Noes, 133. (Division List No. 260.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allen, Charles P.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Bagot, Capt Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn.A. J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW(Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R (Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick Rt. Hn. St John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Chas. (Poplar)
Caldwell, James
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh
Cawley, Frederick
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. (Birm)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn JA (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T (S'thampton)
Chapman, Edward
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clive, Captain Percy A
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. EdwH. Athole
Cook, Sir Fredk. Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt Hn. Sir Joseph C
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dobbie, Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Edwards, Frank
Egerton, Hn. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Rt HnAilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J Manc'r)
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R.B.(Inv'rn'ssBghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk
Gordon, Hn JE(Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, MajEvans(T'rH'mlets)
Goschen, Hn George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Griffith, Ellis J.
Groves, James Grimble
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq of(L'donderry)
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir Jas. (Staffords.N.W)
Henderson Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J F (Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Hozier, Hn. Jas. Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herb. Merton
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col.W
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, ReginaldJ(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, D. (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis(EdinburghW
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Fredk G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott(Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert W.
Percy, Earl
Philipps, John Wynford
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt. Col Edward
Purvis, Robert

Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rose, Charles Day
Round, Rt. Hn. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn.Col EdwJ
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J.E.B(IsleofWight)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Chas. Edw (Stafford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H.C(North'mbTyneside
Smith, RtHnJParker(Lanarks)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col Sir CEH(Sheffield)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Welby, Lt.-Col A CE(Taunton)
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (AshtonundLyne)
Whitmore, Chas. Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Woodhouse, Sir JT(Hudd'rsfi'd
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C.B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N.E. (YorkNRWhitby
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir Wm. Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(CavanW)
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, HughAlex(Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Kean, John
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col JohnP (Galway, N,
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (RoscommonN
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)

Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull,W.)
Wilson, FredW (Norfolk, Mid)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress, to sit again to-morrow.

ALIENS [EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salary and remuneration of any officers, inspectors, or persons appointed under any Act of the present session to amend the Law with regard to Aliens, and of any expenses incurred in carrying such Act into effect."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded to put forthwith the Question.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 214; Noes, 152. (Division List No. 261.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.HnHughO.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt C. B (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch
Banbury, Sir Ferderick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbysh.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm
Chamberlain, Rt. HnJA(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T (S'thampton)
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers
Egerton, Hn. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York
Fellowes, Rt.HnAilwynEdw.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. SirJ(Mancr
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R B(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue

Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Gordon, MajEvans- (T'rH'm'ts
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq of (L'donderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir Jas. (StaffordsN.W)
Henderson, Sir A (Stafford,W)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J F (Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herb. Merton
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col.W
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut. General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, HnH.L.W.(Mile End)
Lee, ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(BristolS.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M‘Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW)
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingsh)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Fredk. G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt. Col Edward
Purvis, Robert
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col EdwJ.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East
Smith, H C (North'mbTyneside
Smith, RtHnJParker(Lanarks)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col Sir C EH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hn Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt Col A. C.E(Taunton)
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts)
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (AshtonundLyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, HenryWilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Abraham, Wm. (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, NE(York, NR Whitby
Caldwell James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston

Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John (Invernessh)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis John Edward (Notts)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P (CavanW)
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid(Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
McCrae, George
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col John P. (Galway,N)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P.J(Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, John E (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Charles Henry (HullW
Wilson, Fred W.(NorfolkMid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

Question put, "That the Chairman do report the Resolution to the House."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 160; Noes, 126. (Division List No. 262.)

AYES

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir Wm. Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Bagot, Capt Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn A J (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Chrisch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T.(S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. N. A. E.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt.Hn. A. Akers-
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Rt.Hn.Ailwyn Edw.
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Sir R.B.(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Maj.Evans(T'rH'mlets
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hn Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herb. Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hn.Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn. H.L.W.(MileEnd)
Lee, ArthurH. (HantsFareham
Lees, Sir Elliott, (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred)
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Nicholson, William Graham
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt.Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, George
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hn. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, HC (North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, Rt.Hn.J.Parker(Lanark
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuft, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col.SirCEH(Sheffield)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt·Hn.Sir Wm. H.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (AshtonundLyne
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B.Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Burke, E. Haviland
Buxton,N.E(York,NR,Whitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway
Dewar JohnA(Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (LanarkNE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Grey, Rt.Hn.Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)

Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. JohnP(Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, P, J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Phillipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S.M. (Whitechapel)
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred W(Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir JT(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

MEDICAL ACT (1886) AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time to-morrow.

DOCKYARD AND CONTRACT BUILT SHIPS.

Return ordered, "of Ships of 5,000 tons and upwards built for the Admiralty since the 1st day of January, 1893, in (1) His Majesty's Royal Dockyards; and (2) by Contract, under the following headings:—

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Name of ship.	Displacement.	Where built.	Date laid down.	Date launched.	Date commissioned.	Completed cost.	Excess or saving on estimate.

—(*Mr. Kearley.*)

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, War Stores (Commission) Bill.

Amendments to — Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution) Bill [Lords]; Mansfield Corporation Bill [Lords]; Hastings Tramways Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Adjourned at nineteen minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 11*th July*, 1905.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent:—

1. Consolidated Fund (No. 2).
2. Mr. Speaker's Retirement.
3. War Stores Commission.
4. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10).
5. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13).
6. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4).
7. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7).
8. Highland Railway.
9. Great Northern Railway.
10. University College, London (Transfer).
11. Weaver Navigation.
12. Seaham Gas.
13. Swansea Corporation.
14. South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways.
15. Hythe Corporation.
16. Stepney Borough Council (Superannuation).
17. Great Western Railway (New Railways).
18. Hastings Tramways.
19. Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution).
20. Mansfield Corporation.
21. Barrymore Estate.
22. Donovan's Divorce.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

SAT FIRST.

The Lord Boyle (*E. Cork and Orrery*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill; Worcestershire County Council (Bridges) Bill Reported, without Amendment.

London and North-Western Railway Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments.

Earl of Stamford's Cheshire Estate Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill; Dublin United Tramways Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill; Rhondda Urban District Council Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill—(Durham and Framwelgate Order opposed); Bolton Corporation Bill; Wemyss Dock Bill [H.L.]; North Eastern Railway Bill; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. Leave given to the Select Committee to adjourn over To-morrow.

Malvern Water Bill; Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 16th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bills read 2^a accordingly, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Liverpool, etc.) Bill [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.

Hitchin and District Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Paisley District Tramways. Was presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Sections 8 and 9); read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 135.)

Esk Valley Power-Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Esk Valley Power-Gas. Was presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow; read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Section 7), deemed to have been read 2ª; and reported from the Committee. (No. 136.)

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 16th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2_a; agreed to; Bills read 2ª accordingly.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill. Committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill. Committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

Millport Piers and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. Read 3ª (accordingl to order), and passed.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill [H.L.] Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (COMMITTEE ON ROYAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE).

Preliminary Report of the Departmental Committee on the Royal College of Science (including the Royal School of Mines) and questions connected therewith.

ARMY (VOLUNTEERS).

Annual Return of the Volunteer Corps of Great Britain, for the year 1904.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS.

Report of proceedings as regards Ireland, for the year 1904.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PUBLIC MEETINGS (FACILITIES) BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee, to be received on Thursday next, and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 134.)

SHIPOWNERS' NEGLIGENCE (REMEDIES) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD LUDLOW: My Lords, although this a short Bill, I think I shall be able to satisfy your Lordships that it is a very important one. Its object is to remedy a very great grievance, indeed a very great injustice, that now exists. The Bill in no way alters the existing law, but enables it to be put into effect. It enables those workmen who ought to have the benefit of the law as it stands to get that benefit. As your Lordships are aware, the legislation passed for a great many years has been in favour of protecting the workman in his employment, and, as far as possible, seeing that when he is injured he is compensated. Various Acts have been passed for that purpose. There have been the Factory Acts, the Workmen's Compensation Act, and the Employers' Liability Act. This Bill does not quite guard the workman against the same injury as the Employers' Liability Act. What this Bill really does is to protect the workman, not against the injury caused in his employment by the immediate employer, but rather by a third person.

As your Lordships know, a dock, wharf, and harbour are now held to be a factory under the Factory Acts. Inspectors can go there and inspect the ships and the process of loading and unloading; and if a workman is injured while employed in loading or unloading he is able to obtain compensation. At the present moment the difficulty is to carry that law into force. In the event of a man being injured on a British ship in a British port, the shipowner being resident in this country, the workman brings his action and gets compensation; but in the case of a foreign ship in a British port a very different thing takes place. Foreign ships come into our ports, and men go on board to load and unload, and not infrequently they are injured in that employment. But what happens in those cases at the present moment? The workman brings his action, but there is nobody upon whom he can serve the notice as the foreign ship has sailed away. He then goes to the agent and serves the notice upon him. Cases have occurred in which he brings his action and wins it, but when he goes to get his compensation he finds there is no one from whom he can claim it. The agent is held not to be a shipowner, but merely an agent for loading and unloading the ship, and in a case of that kind the workman is not only non-suited, but has the burden of the costs of the action thrown upon him. I am sure your Lordships will admit that that is very unfair.

Although that seems a great hardship, it may be contended that a case of that kind never occurs. I may inform your Lordships that within the last eight years, in the port of London alone, there have been eight cases of fatal injury and fifty cases of serious injury. In every one of these cases the workmen brought actions, and in a great many they won their actions, but they got no redress, because in all those cases the foreign shipowner was not resident in this country and the ship had sailed, and therefore there was nobody to recover compensation from. If there have been fifty cases of serious injury and eight fatal cases in the port of London alone in eight years, I am sure your Lordships will understand that the number must be very considerable when the whole of the ports throughout the United Kingdom are taken into consideration. If any damage is done to a British ship by a foreign vessel coming into port colliding with that ship, we at once arrest that foreign vessel under Admiralty jurisdiction, and the vessel is detained in this country until security is given for any compensation that may be awarded in any action at law. In this Bill we ask that what takes place in regard to a foreign ship when she is in collision with another vessel shall take place as regards personal injury on board in consequence of the wrongful act, neglect, or default of the owners of the ship, master, or officers, or crew thereof, or any person in the employment of the owners of the ship. We ask that in such cases the ship should be detained until the shipowner or master satisfies the Court that when an action is brought there will be a defendant from whom redress can be obtained.

The present system, under which foreign ships can sail away and escape liability, is very hard on the British workman and on the British shipowner. If this Bill passes your Lordships' House, the result will be that English and foreign vessels will be put on an equal footing, and the foreign vessel will no longer trade with great advantages in this matter over the British ship. It will make effective the law which already exists, which is that a workman damaged or injured through the negligence of a shipowner, or the officers and crew on board the ship, shall be compensated. This Bill simply makes the Act effective. It will do away with a distinct grievance that workmen now labour under, and in every way will be a great benefit to the British shipowner. To sum up the Bill, it proposes to put British and foreign shipowners on the same footing, and to secure that in future a workman injured on board a ship shall be able to bring his action, and, if he succeeds, recover. If this Bill passes, there will be no longer any reason for British ships being sailed under a foreign flag. There are many cases where this is done simply for this purpose. The Bill has been carefully considered in another place, has met with no opposition, and has received the approval of the Attorney-General; I, therefore, hope your Lordships will give it a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Ludlow.*)

LORD HENEAGE: My Lords, I do not rise to object to this Bill, but to ask the noble Lord in charge of it whether, when we go into Committee, he will consider an Amendment on the lines of that moved by Mr. McArthur in another place, and which was withdrawn at the instance of the Attorney-General, who promised to bring up an Amendment or a clause to carry out that which was considered only fair and right by the House generally. It was that if an employer had to compensate his workmen for injuries done through a foreign ship, he should be entitled to get back those damages from the foreign ship. The Attorney-General promised to look into that question and bring up a clause, but when the clause was drafted Mr. McArthur pointed out to the Attorney-General that under it the employer of the ship who had had to pay the compensation could only proceed after he had paid the compensation, and by that time the foreign ship might have gone no one knew where. I think it will be clear that it is ridiculous to put in a clause which leaves such a loophole. I understand from the noble Lord who has moved the Second Reading of this Bill that he is willing to consider that clause again, as also is the Attorney-General, in order to carry out what was the desire of the House of Commons. In those circumstances I only wish to ask the noble Lord whether that is correct. If so, I will endeavour between now and the Committee stage to see him and ascertain if we cannot arrange upon words which will be equally acceptable to the shipowners and to those in charge of the Bill. Meanwhile, generally speaking, I wish to give my cordial support to the Bill.

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

AGRICULTURAL RATES ACT, 1896, ETC., CONTINUANCE BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

HORSE DISEASE IN IRELAND.

*THE EARL OF MAYO rose "To ask His Majesty's Government—(1) What steps have been taken and are being taken to enforce the regulations laid down in the Circular of 1904, respecting epizootic lymphangitis, issued by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland); (2) How many cases are at present known to exist in civilian stables; (3) How many horses have been destroyed, and how many are now in quarantine."

The noble Earl said: My Lords, on June 30th I drew attention to the outbreak of epizootic lymphangitis in Ireland, and I do not wish to say anything now with regard to the introduction of the disease through the importation of infected horses. The replies which the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War gave me on June 30th were satisfactory, inasmuch as he stated that the military authorities had succeeded in stamping out the disease in military stables, and had not had a case since October, 1904. So far, so good. But the noble Earl admitted that he believed the disease was spreading in civilian stables in Ireland. I do not say that it is spreading to an enormous extent, but the worst feature is that the local veterinary surgeons are uncertain in many cases whether horses suffering from epizootic lymphangitis are merely suffering from ordinary farcy. The Department of Agriculture issued a circular, but it is difficult to enforce it for several reasons. One is that the compensation offered when a horse is killed is half the value of the horse up to £40, and this you may imagine, when you come to deal with valuable horses, is practically of no account at all. The danger, therefore, is that the disease is concealed and there is a chance of its spreading.

There is another point in the circular which the Department has issued—namely, that animals infected have to go into quarantine for six months. I know of one case in the county of Kilkenny. A gentleman there has turned out his horses to grass; they are all confined in one field. He has some polo ponies, and he has just received orders that the ponies are not to be removed from the yard, I believe not even from the boxes in which they are actually kept. Now, that is an impossible state of affairs. They have only to remain long enough in the boxes and they will die; and this is all through his buying from an officer in the Army a mare which developed epizootic lymphangitis and had to be shot. It is no good making complaints unless one suggests a remedy, and I might humbly suggest this to the Department of Argiculture, that there should be a compulsory inspection of all horses, mules, and, perhaps donkeys, that exist in the areas where the disease started amongst military horses. That would be a very good beginning. And then I would suggest that a small Commission of expert veterinary surgeons, one or two from the Department, and two or three at least from the military authorities, should be appointed.

The military veterinary surgeons seem to know more about this matter than anybody else, and I hold in my hand a book on the subject which is called "A Treatise on Epizootic Lymphangitis," by Captain Pallin of the Army Veterinary Department. Armed with this book and the circular issued by the Veterinary Department of the Board of Agriculture, there is no reason why a local veterinary surgeon could not, at all events, report a case of suspicion to the Commission in Dublin, and then a member of the Commission could go down and inspect the animal. If that was impossible, some of the discharge from the ulcers of the animal affected could be sent and microscopically examined. The circular, as I have said, mentions that there should be six months quarantine; but in the order issued by the veterinary surgeon of the Department of Agriculture he says the disease is so dangerous, and there is so little chance of remedy, that the best thing to do is to shoot the animal. Therefore, I say that this instruction and the order for six months quarantine do not run together. It seems ridiculous that the head veterinary surgeon of the Department should say horses should be destroyed at once, and that the Department should say they are to be quarantined for six months. I beg to put the Questions standing in my name.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, I am perfectly certain that everyone who knows Ireland will recognise the great importance of the horse-breeding industry in that country, and how necessary it is, if the fame of the breed is to be maintained, and add, as it does, to the revenue of that country, that every care should be taken to stamp out disease. My noble friend has told your Lordships that it is not necessary to allude to the manner in which the disease arose in Ireland. He did not deprecate the manner in which the authorities in Ireland were endeavouring to cope with it and stamp it out.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: The military authorities.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: The noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War rightly stated, in reply to the Question put to him by Lord Mayo the other day, that the military authorities were doing their best to stamp out the disease, and I hope I shall show before I sit down that the Department of Agriculture, who are, of course, responsible in this matter from the civilian point of view, are also doing their utmost to exterminate it. The circular alluded to by my noble friend is that of March, 1904. In reply to his first Question—namely, what steps have been taken and are being taken to enforce the regulations laid down in this circular?—I have to say that precautions respecting confirmation by microscopic examination of cases of the disease, isolation of infected animals and their subsequent slaughter, and thorough cleansing and disinfecting at places of outbreak have constituted part of the ordinary procedure which the local authorities in co-operation with the Department have followed. And, in addition, restrictions have been applied to a number of horses suspected of being exposed to infection as the result of these outbreaks. These restrictions are included in the Order of July 4th, 1905, prohibiting the movement of horses out of the counties of Kilkenny or Waterford, and providing that no other horses except those within the counties of Kilkenny or Waterford should be exhibited at shows held in those counties. The disease, so far as I can gather, has been confined to Kilkenny and Waterford, and that is the reason why these special regulations were made applicable to those counties. I think the authorities have gone a long way in preventing the spread of this most disastrous and dangerous disease.

With regard to the second Question, I have to say that only one apparent case of the disease is known to exist at present in civilian stables in Ireland. The local authorities have been advised to destroy that animal and two other horses that have been kept in the same stable, and the Department have been this day informed that the local authorities have ordered the slaughter of those three horses. In reply to the third Question—namely, how many horses have been destroyed and how many are now in quarantine?—I have to say that twenty-five horses and one ass have been destroyed on civilian premises in Ireland up to the present time in connection with outbreaks of this disease. Three further horses, as I have just told your Lordships, have now been ordered to be slaughtered. Sixty-two other horses and two asses are now in quarantine. Your Lordships would no doubt wish that more drastic measures had been taken, but when the value of the horses, and the fact that the price paid when they are compulsorily slaughtered is small, are considered, I think your Lordships will admit that the authorities are doing their best, according to the means at their disposal, to stamp out the disease. I repeat that the Irish Executive sympathises with the view the noble Earl takes, and can assure him that every step will be taken not only to prevent the spread of the disease, but to entirely stamp it out.

The Marquess of Londonderry.

Earl SPENCER: My Lords, I was unable to be here when my noble friend opposite asked this Question the other day, or I should have spoken upon it. This is a very serious matter, and I regret that Ireland, with which I was so long connected and where I know the value of horses is so great, should have suffered considerably already by this disease. I am glad to hear from the noble Marquess that the Department are taking very vigorous steps to stamp it out. In times gone by I have had a good deal to do with contagious diseases among different animals, and I have noticed that when there is a disease of the virulence which is said to belong to this disease the most drastic remedies are certainly the cheapest in the end; and I, therefore, sincerely trust that the authorities will not shrink from applying the drastic remedy of slaughtering animals to the fullest extent which the circumstances require.

I cannot help thinking that very serious responsibility rests on certain departments in His Majesty's service in regard to this matter. I am informed that officers, on their return from South Africa, reported to the proper authorities at the War Office that very serious disease indeed existed at the depots for horses in South Africa. They felt so strongly about this that one distinguished general officer told me they asked the authorities whether they could re-horse the Army with animals bought in this country, and on receiving a reply in the affirmative they said that that being so the War Office ought not to have one single horse back from the depots in South Africa, which were full of disease. If this advice was given, the Government incurred great responsibility by allowing these animals to come here at all. I would like to know how many military centres have had the disease, and also whether a good many horses were not found to be diseased during the voyage home from South Africa. I heard that in one case a great many horses were thrown overboard suffering from serious disease.

It may be said that as the Government consider they are coping successfully with this disease it is not necessary to refer to what took place before; but we know this, that if a centre of such disease is set up it takes a long while to make certain that the disease has not spread to civilian as well as military establishments. There may be a time of quarantine after which one may be sure that animals in contact have not become infected, but people when they have disease among their horses do not always report it. Sometimes they do not know it; and, therefore, you cannot be quite sure, even after a certain time, that you are safe in the neighbourhood of one of these military depots where the disease existed. I do not know whether the Government will be willing to state how many cases have occurred in the United Kingdom, and whether I am correct in saying that the caution given by officers on their return from South Africa was neglected. If the disease spreads in Ireland it may come over here, because, as we know, a great many horses are brought over from Ireland to this country. We cannot lay too much stress on the great importance of the utmost vigour being exercised in stamping out the disease.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, I associate myself with every word of the speech of my noble friend who has just sat down as to the necessity of dealing with this subject in a most drastic manner. We were told on a former occasion, and again to-day, that in military establishments the disease has been prevented from spreading and entirely stamped out. That has been accomplished because the military authorities can act drastically. There is nobody to object or to raise questions of the value of the horses, and the horses are quickly destroyed and the source of infection removed. The noble Marquess hinted at the point I am going to raise. I refer to the question of compensation. He said the amount received for compensation in cases where horses were killed did not bear a very large proportion to the real value of the animal. If that is the case, naturally people who have a horse which they think may have become infected do not report it at once, because they know that if the animal is slaughtered they will get as compensation a very small proportion of its value. That is false economy indeed. I do not say tnat you ought to go out of your way and pay high prices for worthless stock. That would be absurd. But when a horse is valuable, I think a proper estimate should be made, and the animal should not have a chance of being spared simply on account of its value. I hope the Government will accept the suggestion I have made, and that they will be liberal in granting compensation in respect of animals that are slaughtered, and will announce the fact that they will do so provided it can be shown that the animals are of the value stated.

LORD BURGHCLERE: My Lords, I regret I do not see the noble Lord who represents the English Board of Agriculture in his place, for I should have liked to ask him, with regard to this very serious horse disease, what precautions have been taken to safeguard this country from its incursion. I desire to press on the Government for some reply as to what extent this particular disease has been prevalent in the military depôts, because I think that information would be of immense service to the Board of Agriculture in this country in determining what danger there may be to our horses here. Probably some member of His Majesty's Government will be able to give me the information, or I will put down a Question on the subject to be answered at a future date.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: My Lords, if we had had the slightest idea that this question would have taken this large aspect, and information would have been asked with regard to England, undoubtedly those qualified to address your Lordships on this subject would have been present; but I attended to reply to the specific Questions put by the noble Earl. The noble Earl opposite went a great deal further, and asked questions with regard to the bringing back of horses from South Africa. I am not in a position at the present moment to answer that Question. I had thought, after the discussion which took place on a previous occasion, that it was agreed that the replies given by the noble Earl on behalf of the War Office were satisfactory. I certainly think this question is one of very great importance. I remember we had a disease in the North of England called pink-eye, which took all the energies of the authorities to stamp out; and having had experience of that myself, I can assure the noble Lord that he has my sympathy in this matter, and if he will raise a debate on this question I can assure him that he will be adequately replied to. With regard to the question of compensation, I do not wish to be understood to say that any animal which might be likely to be considered suffering from, or capable of conveying, the disease should be spared, however expensive or valuable it may be. What I wished to convey was that I thought great caution should be exercised before animals of great value were sacrificed which had not suffered from the disease at all. I can assure your Lordships that the Veterinary Department in Ireland, and I imagine also in England, are instructed to examine most closely into the details of this terrible disease, and nothing is wanting on the part of the authorities to deal effectively with it.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, although the representative of the English Board of Agriculture is not in the House to deal with the points raised by the noble Lord opposite, I doubt very much, even if he had been here, whether he could have given him much satisfaction. The fact of the matter is, this is a disease which has been almost wholly imported into this country by Army horses, and the information which I think we all desire to know is to what extent the disease is prevalent amongst military horses, and what precautions are being taken in the military depôts to prevent the spread of the disease to horses the property of civilians. I notice that the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War has just come into the House, and it may be that he will be able to give us some information upon the question, which is primarily one for the War Office and not for the Board of Agriculture, although the Board of Agriculture is the guardian of the health of our horses, flocks, and herds.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): I have not got the English figures with me, but my impression is that there are very few cases in the Army now. We rather pride ourselves that in the Army we have stamped out the disease. We have had no case in Ireland since October, 1904, and I do not think we have had many cases in England lately. I shall, however, be very happy to make inquiry.

LORD BURGHCLERE: Can the noble Earl say whether he has had any communication with the English Board of Agriculture on the subject?

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I cannot answer that Question offhand, but I will be prepared with an Answer if the noble Lord will put the Question down for Thursday.

LORD HENEAGE: Are we to understand that there have been cases amongst Army horses in England as well as in Ireland?

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I think the figure given last year was about 300 odd; but again I am speaking entirely from memory.

THE EARL OF MAYO: I may mention, for the information of noble Lords, that the Army statistics up to July 28th, 1904, show that in England there had been twenty-one centres of infection and in Ireland nine. There were thirty-two cases cured, 254 horses had been destroyed, and 108 remained; so that in England at that time there were twenty-one centres of infection.

ADEN PROTECTORATE AND YEMEN.

LORD REAY rose "To call attention to the necessity for deepening the harbour of Aden, and to the demarcation between the Aden Protectorate and Yemen; and to move for Papers." The noble Lord said: My Lords, I am indebted to the courtesy of the noble Marquess who placed at my disposal the recent correspondence on the deepening of the harbour of Aden, and who authorised me to quote from that correspondence, which is very interesting. In August, 1901, the Bombay Government appointed a Commission to inquire into the necessity for deepening the harbour, and that Commission was presided over by the Chairman of the Bombay Port Trust, Mr. Hughes, than whom no more expert administrator of ports could have been appointed. Great weight attaches to the Report of a Commission presided over by so able an official and it should be very carefully considered, and I should be inclined to adopt the proposals of that Report with regard to the deepening of the harbour.

The Commission point out that the port of Aden is the natural coaling station for the whole trade through the Suez Canal with India, Ceylon, China, and the Australian Colonies, and that any further deepening of the harbour is mainly, if not entirely, necessary to enable vessels of practically any draught to coal and transfer mails and passengers in the shelter of the port. The Commission further recommend that application should be made for a grant-in-aid of £80,000, on the ground that this is more than a work of local importance and is a work of Imperial importance, in which not only British shipping but the shipping of all parts of the world is interested. The Commission also proposed a scheme for a public wharf by reclaiming Tawahi Bay. On that question I admit there has been some difference of opinion, and I do not want to complicate my advocacy of the necessity and importance of deepening the harbour by dwelling on that part of the Report. I therefore put it aside, with only one reservation—that I think it would be prudent to take measures to prevent the alienation of land which may hereafter be required in case the public wharf should be considered necessary.

With regard to the deepening of the harbour, I may say that there is in India among those interested in the matter complete unanimity. The Indian chambers of Commerce, when they were consulted by the Government, all reported in favour of the deepening of the harbour, and the steamship companies whose ships use the port of Aden, have, in a letter to the Government, stated that in consequence of the increased size and draught of steamships it is necessary for the harbour to be dredged to a depth of thirty feet at low water ordinary springtides; also, that a large mooring basin of this depth should be made to afford the space required for manœuvring vessels when approaching and leaving their moorings, and that at least three more mooring buoys should be included in the deep-water area. The Bombay Government have always insisted on the necessity of this work, and in February, 1904, in one of the last documents on the subject, for the perusal of which I am indebted to the courtesy of the noble Marquess, they asked for the loan of one or two dredgers from Gibraltar, which, however, the Admiralty could not supply. I am quite aware that the Aden Port Trust are engaged in deepening and extending the mooring basin, but, according to their own admission, it will take fifteen years to complete the work with the Trust's own unaided resources.

It seems clear that Aden will remain useless as a coaling station for ships of greater tonnage than second-class cruisers until the entrance channel and moorings and swinging basin are dredged and widened. We cannot lose sight of the fact that Aden is the only port between Suez and Bombay—a distance of 3,000 miles—which could afford safe accommodation for ships of greater tonnage. The Commission are satisfied that if Aden is to maintain its position as a trading centre active measures are desirable, besides the improvement of the port in order to develop trade, and they urge the improvement of communications with the interior on the Arabian side. They recommend a railway from Aden carried as far as practicable in the direction of Sana. I understand—perhaps the noble Marquess will give us information on the point—that a concession has been applied for in order to make a railway from Aden to Nobat Dakin *via* Lahej. That, of course, would involve the co-operation of the Sultan of Lahej, which no doubt could be obtained.

The Commission also attached great importance to a railway from Berbera to Harrar—a railway which would connect our Somali coast ports with Harrar, and therefore make us independent of the line from Jibuti to Harrar. On this railway there would be considerable traffic with Ogaden as well as with Abyssinia. The Commission further express the hope—and this point seems to me to be one of importance—that the duties levied on imports and exports in our Somali coast ports should be considered with a view to a reduction, because the existence of those duties tends to put a premium on trade by other available routes which are free from duties.

I suppose there will be no objection to publishing the Report of the Aden Commission. I think it is very important that its contents should be more widely known, and it has already, as I have said, been communicated to the chambers of commerce in India. I would further ask the noble Marquess, in order to show the importance of the trade of Aden, to give us the figures of that trade for 1902–3, 1903–4, 1904–5, as regards three categories—foreign trade of Aden, local trade of Aden, Indian trade of Aden. The figures are given in this correspondence for the previous years, and they are very interesting.

I shall only say a word about the demarcation of the boundary line. On that question I understand that there will be no objection to give us such information as is absolutely necessary in order to form an opinion on the subject. I believe I am right in stating that the Government have been successful in getting the boundary line between our protectorate and the Turkish province of Yemen demarcated. When the Papers are given I hope they will include a map on the subject, so that we may be able to find out which of the tribes are under British influence and which of the tribes are under Turkish influence—I say under Turkish influence, although

there seems to be some doubt how far at present Turkish influence extends in Yemen.

I would also ask the noble Marquess whether he has received information that negotiations are going on between the Turkish Government and the Arab Imam of Yemen, who has already captured Sana, his dynastic capital, and, besides, has also occupied Mocha. These negotiations, I understand, are on the basis that the Imam shall pay tribute to Turkey as a feudatory and receive a grant of internal autonomy over upper Yemen and Sana. Perhaps the noble Marquess can inform us what the prospect is of order being maintained in Yemen, when the Imam obtains this autonomy, and whether in the arrangement which is contemplated Turkish troops will still be located on that side of the border. or whether the internal autonomy involves that the Turkish troops will no longer occupy that territory. Is it intended to take any steps in order to secure that the new boundary line will be respected? I believe the noble Marquess will allow me to move for the Report, for the trade statistics, and also for such Papers as the Government can communicate with regard to the demarcation of the boundary line.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for—1. Report on Aden Harbour by the Aden Commission, appointed in August, 1901. 2. Figures of the recent trade of Aden; foreign, local and Indian. 3. Papers on the boundary line between Yemen and the Aden Protectorate."—(*The Lord Reay.*)

LORD BRASSEY: My Lords, as a member of the Commission on the Defences of the Coaling Stations, I feel it my duty to say a few words in support of the Motion of my noble friend. Many of your Lordships are familiar with the port of Aden and know its external aspect. The charts show how circumscribed is the anchorage. That defect should have been remedied long ago. The Government have dealt with the question of the defences. They have been strengthened and brought thoroughly up-to-date, but the port has been neglected. My noble friend has pointed out that the coaling facilities are not as satisfactory as could be wished. Then there are considerations with regard to defence. A limited number of ships assembled in the anchorage would seriously impede the action of the batteries, and those ships would be imperfectly protected. If the harbour were deepened the ships would be well protected and would not lie in the line of fire of the batteries. The cost of the work which is necessary is inconsiderable; it is simply a work of dredging, and it has been strongly recommended by every Committee of experts which has had under consideration the defences of Aden and the improvement of the port for the purpose of trade. Action has no doubt been delayed owing to the difficulty of the apportionment of the expenditure. It would seem but fair that the expenditure should be divided between the Home Government and the Government of India. It is quite unnecessary to enlarge on the importance of the position of Aden both as a naval and commercial port, and I hope the step which my noble friend has taken this afternoon may have the effect of inducing that action which has been far too long delayed.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (The Marquess of BATH): My Lords, I have to thank the noble Lord who has raised this question for his courtesy in supplying me with the headings of the Questions which he proposed to ask, and which cover a wide extent of country as well as a considerable number of subjects. The first Question asked by the noble Lord was with regard to the intentions of the Government as to the Report of the Commission on the improvement of Aden Harbour. The noble Lord passed by deliberately that portion of the Report which recommended in very strong terms the building of wharfage with a number of landing piers to accommodate the largest vessels and men-of-war. It was a proposal the cost of which the Commission themselves placed at eighteen lakhs of rupees. I am bound to allude to it because I contend that the Report of the Commission must be dealt with as a whole, and that all their recommendations must be taken into consideration. The other part of the Report recommended the dredging of the inner harbour to a uniform depth of thirty feet. The estimated cost of this part of the scheme they fixed at twelve lakhs of rupees, or, as the noble Lord said, £80,000.

It is perfectly correct, as the noble Lord stated, that the whole of the chambers of commerce in India were strongly in favour of this portion of the Report, provided that the Imperial Government bore the cost. They were equally unanimous, I think I am correct in saying, in strongly condemning the first portion of the Report with regard to the wharfage, because they declared that it was not required and that the estimates of the Commission were wrong. In forwarding the recommendation the Commissioners urged that the Port Trust could repay the first loan of eighteen lakhs for the wharfage scheme from the increased receipts obtainable from the harbour if the Government of India would lend the money, but they were opposed, as I think all are opposed, to an increase in the harbour dues. The Commissioners also urged that the dredging of the harbour was an Imperial question, especially on account of the fact that Aden was a fortress and a naval station. I do not want to labour the point, but, as the noble Lord stated, the Port Trust are at this moment engaged in deepening the harbour, though it will take some fifteen or sixteen years, as they only have about a lakh a year to play with.

With regard to the strategic question, the Admiralty, when they were consulted two or three years back, expressed the opinion that there were other matters of much greater need which required to be dealt with, and said that, so far as they were concerned, they could not recommend the adoption of these proposals. That is still the opinion of the Admiralty, who consider that there are far more important requirements than the deepening of Aden Harbour. Perim, on the line of route, affords every facility for the coaling of the largest ships of war, and the Admiralty do not consider the deepening of Aden Harbour a matter of strategic importance. I regret, as I am sure your Lordships must do, the causes that prevent my noble friend the First Lord of the Admiralty from being in his place to-day; but, of course, in this matter I could only consult the naval authorities, and this I understand to be their opinion now as strongly as it was when they were last consulted. They were also asked to lend two dredgers free of cost to the Port Trust in order that the work of dredging might be got on with rather more quickly, but the Aden people seem to have been misinformed on the subject. The dredgers were not lying idle at Gibraltar as they were supposed to be.

To come to the decision which was arrived at, the Government of Bombay and the Government of India agreed that the wharfage scheme was financially unsound and that the Port Trust would not be able to repay the loan from its revenue. The Government of India have expressed their desire to consider the practicability of any scheme that may be placed before them, but they are not prepared, as at present advised, to provide money for the immediate deepening of the harbour. I hope the noble Lord will understand that I do not for a moment deny that the further deepening of Aden Harbour is an important matter, or that the Port Trust can do any more than they are doing with their present income. The figures which I am authorised to supply to the noble Lord in answer to his Question, and which will be laid upon the Table of the House, show a material increase in the trade of the port. We have not got the figures up to last year but have telegraphed for them, and we have every reason to believe that they are satisfactory. I am also able to assent to the Motion which the noble Lord makes that the Report of the Commission shall be laid on the Table, and, although I cannot say exactly when that will take place, or whether or not we shall wait till we have had an answer from the Government of India with regard to the question we have put to them as to when we may expect a revised scheme, still the Papers shall be laid upon the Table of the House.

I would only say, before parting with this portion of the noble Lord's Question, that the decision which has been arrived at is so far not a final one. The Government of India are perfectly prepared to consider any practicable scheme that may be placed before them, but at present no such scheme is forthcoming. I am bound to add that the Report to which the noble Lord has drawn attention has not yet been before the Secretary of State, although he does actually know of its existence, but I trust that the inquiries we are making of the Governments of India and of Bombay will enable us to give a further Answer to the noble Lord.

There are no schemes at present under consideration with regard to railways from Harrar to Berbera, or from Aden in the direction of Sana. A concession for a railway in the territory of Lahej had been in a fair way of settlement, but the Abdali Sultan had omitted to refer to the British authorities, as bound by the Treaty of 1849, which required him to refer all things relating to the peace, progress, and prosperity of Aden, and when our representatives looked into the scheme it was found that there were several grave objections to it. There was a provision boycotting Jews and Europeans, and the scheme was not worked out in sufficient detail. Another scheme is being awaited, none yet submitted having recommended itself to the approval of the authorities. I am unable to supplement the information in the public Press with regard to what is going on in Yemen, or to predict the result of the negotiations now going on, but it is hoped that, either by these negotiations or by the more energetic measures which it is understood the Turkish Government are preparing to take, some sort of order will be restored among the tribes throughout the district.

As to the Aden Hinterland, a line has been demarcated from Sheikh Murahd, on the coast opposite Perim, to the River Bana, embracing the Subaihi, the Haushabi, and the Amiri tribes. From the Bana it is agreed that the line should go in a north-easterly direction as far as the desert, but it has not been considered necessary by the two Governments actually to demarcate this line. In this demarcation we have followed the representations made as far back as 1873 by Lord Granville to the Turkish Government. No tribes have been transferred from one sphere of influence to another on either side, and our liabilities and responsibilities remain unaltered. Direct British administration has never been established over these tribes, and is not established now. They are under a protectorate, and the policy of the Government always has been to refrain from intervention in their tribal affairs.

We have, however, recognised that there are certain duties which the tribes ought to perform. The representations of 1873 were based upon treaties with sections of the tribes. Arrangements have been made with other sections of the same tribes on the same lines as formerly, with the exception of one in the case of the Amir of Dthala. We on our side give protection and a small subsidy to the tribes. On their side they permit no foreign interference, undertake that there will be no alienation of territory except with the consent of the British Government, and maintain the trade routes. The country of the Amir of Dthala was that in which we had trouble some time ago, and the two Governments have now been able to come to an agreement with regard to delimitation, but it has always been exposed to difficulties from the Turkish side of the frontier. In his treaty, therefore, special provision has been added that he should protect the boundary pillars, keep order within his own boundary, and keep a small force of not more than fifty men to enforce his authority. His subsidy has been increased for that purpose. While we have not in any way extended our liabilities, we have reduced the chance of trouble by having a clear and definite understanding as to the boundary and the obligations of the tribes on each side of the frontier.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: My Lords, I entirely agree with my noble friends behind me as to the commercial importance of the harbour of Aden, and anything that can be done for the improvement of that harbour for commercial purposes would be of very great advantage. I understand from the noble Marquess the Under-Secretary of State for India that the matter is still under the consideration of His Majesty's Government. I believe that the Report of the Commission is dated 1901. We have now arrived at 1905, and the noble Marquess tells us that the Report has not yet been regularly before the Secretary of State. I should hope, after four years delay, that no further delay may take place in considering the matter. This question is undoubtedly one of great importance and one in which, as the noble Marquess knows very well, much interest is felt at Bombay by those engaged in commercial enterprise. But I confess that in this, as in all other things connected with India, when they involve anything in the nature of a charge on Indian revenues, I find myself in a difficulty. The object may be very important, very necessary, but the financial resources of India are so limited that when appeals of this kind are made and the Government of India say they cannot do what is asked, I am not very much inclined to press for the expenditure. I see vast proposals for military expenditure to be charged, I imagine, upon the revenues of India. In those circumstances, I am well aware that the civil and commercial interests of India will inevitably suffer; but at the same time, when the opportunity offers and the Secretary of State can find leisure to read this Report, I hope he will acknowledge that it is very desirable to improve the harbour of Aden, which is a very important port of call for commercial purposes.

*LORD REAY: I understand that there is no objection to my Motion for the Aden Report, for the figures of recent trade, and for Papers on the boundary line?

*THE MARQUESS OF BATH: None.

*LORD REAY: There is only one point on which I wish to make a further observation. The noble Marquess the Under-Secretary will have noticed that I did not press for the deepening of the harbour of Aden on account of any strategic reasons.

*THE MARQUESS OF BATH: I referred to that matter because the chambers of commerce rather made a point of it.

*LORD REAY: I urged the deepening of the harbour on account of the commercial importance of the port, and I need not say that I heard with pleasure from the noble Marquess that the Government of India are prepared to consider any further scheme which may be placed before them. I think their eyes are so completely turned to the North-West that there is some risk that other parts of the Empire under their control are liable to be neglected; and it was for that reason that I thought it right to offer the few observations I addressed to your Lordships this evening. I may add that I also heard with satisfaction that it is not intended to interfere more directly in the administration of the internal affairs of the tribes, and that the policy of leaving them in an autonomous condition, subject to the reservations the noble Marquess referred to, will be maintained.

On Question, Motion agreed to; and ordered accordingly.

PASSENGERS TO PLACES OUT OF EUROPE.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Duke of MARLBOROUGH): My Lords, I beg to move for the Return which stands in the name of the noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal, and in doing so I may remind your Lordships that this Return is very similar to one which was moved for at the beginning of this session and to which your Lordships assented. That was a Return of the number of aliens arriving from the Continent at ports in the United Kingdom in each month of the year 1905. The Return for which I am now moving is to enable figures to be prepared as to the numbers and nationalities of the passengers leaving the United Kingdom for places outside Europe in each month from June to December, 1905, the desire being that this Return should form a sort of a complement to the others which have in previous years been laid before Parliament.

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing the Numbers and Nationalities of the Passengers that left the United Kingdom for Places out of Europe in each month from June to December, 1905, distinguishing the principal countries in which the passengers contracted to land."—(*The Duke of Marlborough.*)

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I confess I am still somewhat surprised at the Motion. In the first place, I think it is wrong grammatically. It is very curious to speak of passengers who "left the United Kingdom" on a future date. It would, I think, be more grammatical to say who "left or shall have left." However, I think it is a mistake to order a Return going beyond the period reached. It would surely be sufficient when Parliament meets to move for a Return for the previous year.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): If the Return is to be for the information of Parliament when it meets next year, surely Parliament will be better informed if the information is up to the end of the year. With regard to the suggested alteration in the grammar of the Motion, my noble friend the Under-Secretary informs me that the previous Return was moved in exactly the same form.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: On that occasion the grammatical error may not have been noticed, but I hope, now that it has been pointed out, that there will be no objection to putting the Motion right.

* THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I do not understand that the grammatical alteration will qualify the sense of the Motion, and we therefore agree to it.

On Question, Motion, as amended, agreed to and ordered accordingly.

MOROCCO.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, on the Motion for the adjournment of the House, I beg to ask the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Question of which I have given him private notice, namely, whether it is true that the French and German Governments have come to an agreement with regard to a conference on the affairs of

Morocco; and, if so, what is the position of His Majesty's Government with regard to it and whether they will enter into a conference as the French Government appear to have agreed to do.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, we have been officially informed, but only within the last few hours, that the French and German Governments have come to an agreement as to the basis on which a conference with regard to the affairs of Morocco might be held in compliance with the invitation issued some time ago to that effect by the Sultan of that country. The conference will therefore, no doubt, take place; and if it does take place the interests of this country in Morocco are of such a character that we should certainly think it right to participate in the proceedings of that conference. We shall, therefore, accept the proposal, which will, no doubt, be made to us to join upon suitable conditions with the other Powers in the discussions which will arise.

STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That they have added the Earl Cadogan to the Standing Committee; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

PASSENGERS TO PLACES OUT OF EUROPE.

Return (in part) respecting; laid before the House (pursuant to order of this day), and to be printed. (No. 137.)

House adjourned at ten minutes past Six o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter-past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 11th July, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

COMMISSION.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners;

The House went;—and, being returned;—Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills (See page 213).

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Rhymney and Aber Valley Gas and Water Company Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Gosport and Fareham Tramways Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed—

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Select Committee—

1. That, in the case of the South Barracas (Buenos Ayres) Gas and Coke Company Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

2. "That, in the case of the Dover Harbour Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

Resolutions agreed to.

Littlehampton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order relating to the

Counties of Essex and Hertford not confirmed; Remaining Orders confirmed] [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).

Colonel **Welby** reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills; That the parties promoting the Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) (Belfast, Castlereagh, and Holywood Order) Bill had stated that the evidence of W. Redfern Kelly, Engineer to the Belfast Harbour Commissioners, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said W. Redfern Kelly do attend the said Committee on Thursday, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That W. Redfern Kelly do attend the Committee on Group J of Private Bills on Thursday, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 8).

Mr. **Ashton** reported from the Committee on Group 8 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned until Thursday, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP E).

Sir **Henry Aubrey-Fletcher** reported from the Committee on Group E of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Friday, at Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Woolwich Borough Council Bill; Great Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill; Andover Lighting and Power Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Brentford, Croydon (Rural), Durham Districts, Eastbourne (Willingdon Extension), Gravesend (Extension to Northfleet), Kingsbury, Old Windsor, and Wimborne and District." [Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Metropolitan Electric Supply Company, Limited, with respect to electrical energy; and for other purposes." [Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [Lords].

Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 268.]

PETITIONS,

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TAXATION AND PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.

Petition from Islington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SINGH, MAHARAJAH MADHO.

Petition from Pannah State, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table.

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) PREVENTION AND COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Newcastle-upon-Tyne, against; to lie upon the Table.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Maidstone; and Wandsworth; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).

Paper [presented 10th July]; to be printed. [No. 237.]

ARMY (VOLUNTEER CORPS).

Copy presented, of Annual Return of the Volunteer Corps of Great Britain for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (VOLUNTEERS).

Copy presented, of Circular Letter addressed to General Officers Commanding in Chief, in substitution for the Circular Letter of 20th June, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).

Copy presented, of Preliminary Report of the Departmental Committee on the Royal College of Science (including the Royal School of Mines), and Questions connected therewith [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Rule). Copy of Draft Additional Rule in Divorce and Matrimonial Causes under The Rules Publication Act, 1893 [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

The "Kew Bulletin."

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, pending a decision as to the renewed publication of the *Kew Bulletin*, steps will be taken to complete the volume for 1901, which is still incomplete, in view of the quantity of unpublished matter which had been prepared for the *Bulletin*.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he can explain why the alleged increasing demands upon the scientific staff have been held to justify the discontinuance of the *Kew Bulletin*, seeing that the present director, in his evidence before the Committee of Botanical Work, spoke of the *Bulletin* having become a continuous record of Kew work in all its aspects; and whether, in view of the fact that information formerly given in the appendices is still published year by year, it is proposed to continue the issue of appendices to volumes which have no existence.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) The issue of the *Kew Bulletin* as a separate publication is not of the same importance as was formerly the case, inasmuch as some of the most important articles from an economic point of view are now printed in the Journal and leaflets issued by the Board of Agriculture. The information given in the appendices to which the hon. Member refers has a value quite independent of the *Bulletin* itself, and, whatever may be the decision arrived at with regard to further issues of that publication, it will doubtless be of advantage that that information should be made available for the use of the public in one form or another. I shall be glad to consider the hon. Member's suggestion as to the completion of the volume for 1901 in connection with the further investigation of the matter which I have undertaken to make.

Report of Scottish Agricultural Commission.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, in view of the condition of British agriculture, the scarcity of employment, and the necessity for diffusion of knowledge among all classes, he will cause to be distributed among the various agricultural associations of Great Britain the Report of the Scottish Agricultural Commission of 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) The Report in question is of considerable interest, and I propose to have it carefully examined with a view to ascertain whether it will enable us to supplement in any way the full information as to agricultural conditions and methods in Denmark which has from time to time been published both by the Irish Department of Agriculture and ourselves. The Report has, however, no official character, and I should scarcely be justified, therefore, in purchasing copies at the public expense for distribution in the manner suggested. It is, moreover, published at a price which should bring it within reach of all concerned.

Admiralty Orders for Armour Plate.

MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): To ask the Secretary to the

Admiralty whether he can say when further orders for armour plate for the needs of the Admiralty are likely to be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) A contract for a small quantity of armour is being placed during the present week. Contracts for further quantities will, it is expected, be placed by the end of the month.

Wireless Telegraphy in the Navy.

Sir THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state to what extent the system of wireless telegraphy has now been applied to His Majesty's Fleet.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The system of wireless telegraphy has been applied generally to all battleships and cruisers and certain special craft.

Age Limit for Major-Generals, Royal Marines.

Mr. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is proposed to reconsider the age limit for major-generals, Royal Marines, who at present do not retire until the age of sixty-five, whereas, in the executive and other branches of the Royal Navy, officers of corresponding rank retire at sixty years of age, or earlier if unemployed for periods varying from three to five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) It is not proposed to make a change in the manner suggested. The regulations governing the service and retirement of officers of the Royal Marines are not based on the same general principles as those applied to officers of the Navy.

Swine Fever.

Mr. A. K. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the progressive decrease of outbreaks of swine fever shown in each quarter of 1904, as compared with the corresponding quarter of 1903, was continued in the first two quarters of 1905, as compared respectively with the first two quarters of 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) I am glad to say that the decrease in the number of outbreaks of swine fever in 1904 as compared with 1903 has been more than maintained this year, as will be seen from the following table:—

Period.	1905.	1904.	1903.
1st Quarter	155	320	353
2nd Quarter . . .	267	478	526
3rd Quarter	—	240	306
4th Quarter . . .	—	158	293
Total for the Year.	—	1,196	1,478

The number of outbreaks during the first six months of the current year has been 422 as compared with 798 in the corresponding period of 1904, a decrease of 47 per cent.

Report on Causes and Symptoms of Swine Fever.

Mr. A. K. LOYD: To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the Report of the further inquiry, instituted by the late Mr. Hanbury, on the causes and symptoms of swine fever has been issued; and, if not, when its issue may be expected.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) The investigations to which the hon. Member refers are complete, and Reports thereon are now in course of preparation. They are expected to be available early in September.

Suggested Issue of Monthly Reports on Trade of Foreign Countries.

Sir SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that a daily Consular Report upon the trade of foreign countries is issued in the United States of America, and that weekly Reports are issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce of Canada; and whether, in view of the inconvenience caused to commercial men in this country owing to being unable to obtain the Reports of British Consuls on the trade of foreign countries until they are often useless, he will consider the advisability of instructing British Consuls to forward short monthly Reports on the trade of the countries to which they are credited.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) I am aware of the Reports referred to. The weekly Board of Trade journal includes a large amount of commercial information, based on Reports specially supplied by British Consuls, who have been required since 1886 to send home short notes suitable for this purpose. Where even more immediate publication is desirable, in the interests of British trade, the Board of Trade make a practice of sending notices to the Press. The annual Consular Reports, whether of this country or of the United States, cannot of course be prepared until the necessary statistics are available, and are mainly reviews of the trade of the year.

British and Foreign Troops in Crete.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what are the numbers of British and international troops respectively occupying Crete; under whose command are these troops; for what purpose are they there; and how long will they remain.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The number of British troops in the island is 923, of French 480, who are about to receive a reinforcement of 200, of Italian 290, and of Russian 630, exclusive of 320 troops who are on their way. The British troops are under the command of the senior British officer, who acts with the advice of His Majesty's Consul-General. Should the troops be engaged in joint operations with the Foreign contingents the senior officer present, irrespective of nationality, will assume command. The international troops are maintained in Crete for the purpose of enabling the protecting Powers properly to fulfil the obligations assumed by them at the time when their intervention secured the autonomy of the island, and the withdrawal of the Turkish troops.

Finding of Gold Ornaments in Ireland.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if the Treasury have received any information as to the finding of certain gold ornaments in Ireland recently; and, if not, if inquiry will be made into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) No report has been received as to the finding of any gold ornaments in Ireland recently. If the hon. Baronet will be good enough to mention the locality of the alleged discovery, inquiries will be made.

Publication of Manuscripts of Irish Franciscans.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury when the manuscripts of the Irish Franciscans will be published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I am informed that the printing of the manuscripts is well in hand.

Education of Labourers in India.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the correspondence which has passed between him and the Indian Government on the subject of education of labourers generally in India, and in particular on plantations, whether he has now received the further Reports promised by the Assam and Bengal Governments in 1904; and, if so, will he make them public.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I have received a reply from the Government of Bengal, which I shall be glad to communicate to the hon. Member. The Chief Commissioner of Assam thinks it advisable to defer dealing with the subject for another year, and will report later on.

The King-Harman Estate.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners can state the total amount offered by them to the vendor of the King-Harman Estate and accepted for the rural portion of the estate, and the amount of the bonus on same; and whether they can state the total amount asked by the vendor and the total amount offered by them for the town portion of the estate, and the amount of the bonus on same.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The amount of the purchase money of the rural portion of this estate, the purchase of which has been completed, is £391,521. The Commissioners have agreed to purchase a portion of the town holdings in actual possession of tenants for £15,835. The bonus in each case amounts to 12 per cent. of the purchase money. I must decline to give information as to negotiations which have not been completed.

Destruction of Ancient Monument on the King-Harman Estate.

MR. TULLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners can state which of their inspectors reported as to the destruction of the ancient monument recently by malicious injury on the King-Harman Estate; what was the nature of his report, and how long after the injury was his inspection made; and what steps have the Estates Commissioners taken to have the monument repaired and the present defacements removed from it.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The Commissioners have instructed one of their surveyors, who is an architect, to report upon this matter, but his report has not yet been received.

Completion of Works at Poulduff Pier, County Wexford.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the work at Poulduff Pier, county Wexford, will be

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The legal formalities in connection with the contract for this work have not yet been completed, but the matter is being pressed forward.

Appointment of Resident Manager of Lislea No 1 National School.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education are now in a position to appoint a resident manager of the Lislea No. 1 National School, county Armagh, in accordance with the declared wishes of the parents of children attending the school.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) A clerical successor has not yet been appointed to the Rev. Mr. Ingram, the former manager. Pending such an appointment the Rev. Mr. Simpson continues to act as manager.

Army Recruiting.

MR. LAMBERT: To ask the Secretary of State for War what steps have been taken with regard to recruiting for the short-service and general-service Army respectively; and, if no steps have been taken, will he state when it is proposed to commence recruiting for these two classes of service.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The figures given in reply to a Question put to-day by the hon. Member for the Thanet Division of Kent will explain the results of the introduction of the nine years enlistment scheme. The commencement of short-service recruiting must depend upon the progress made in recruiting for general service, but, in view of the figures which I have given to the House to-day, I am hopeful that the date for opening short-service recruiting may be reached within the present year.

Militia Battalions and the Short-Service Army.

MR. LAMBERT: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any Militia battalions have given their consent to being merged in the short-service Army; and whether it is proposed to proceed with that scheme without a direct sanction from Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) No request of the kind referred to in the Question has been made to Militia battalions, nor has it ever been contemplated that Militia battalions should be merged, but that they should continue to exist under somewhat changed conditions of service. No such change can be made without the consent of officers and men serving, and the consent of Parliament will not be required in the event of any such change being made. It is not intended at present to give this opportunity to the Militia.

Army Recruiting—Long and Short Service.

MR. MARKS (Kent, Thanet): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state what results have been obtained by recruiting on the nine years term of enlistment for the general-service

Army since the introduction of that system in October last, stating the figures month by month, and showing how they compare with the results obtained for the corresponding months of the previous year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The figures are as follows :—

	For 12 Years.	For 3 Years.	For 9 Years.	Total.
October, 1903	104	3,119	—	3,223
November, 1903	106	2,638	—	2,744
December, 1903	67	2,207	—	2,274
January, 1904	89	3,698	—	3,787
February, 1904	87	2,798	—	2,885
March, 1904	86	2,360	—	2,446
April, 1904	51	1,986	—	2,037
May, 1904	58	1,325	—	1,383
June, 1904	57	1,702	—	1,759
	705	21,833	—	22,538

	For 12 years.	For 3 years.	For 9 years.	Total.
October, 1904	129	1,940	386	2,455
November, 1904	67	5	2,337	2,409
December, 1904	79	—	2,182	2,261
January, 1905	76	—	2,852	2,928
February, 1905	79	1	1,959	2,039
March, 1905	102	—	1,646	1,748
April, 1905	73	—	835	908
May, 1905	48	—	926	974
June, 1905	43	—	1,088	1,131
	696	1,946	14,211	16,853

NOTE.—Cavalry recruiting closed until January, 1905. Royal Army Medical Corps closed in 1903, opened in London, 20th May, 1904. Army Ordnance Corps only open to headquarters since 1902. Army Service Corps open to drivers. October, 1904, and artificers; otherwise only open to mechanical transport. Royal Artillery—Horse and Field practically closed in 1903; reopened about December, 1904. Royal Garrison Artillery—Generally opened July, 1904. Royal Engineers—Opened in certain districts for drivers in February, 1904, and generally for drivers in all districts April, 1904, and again shut 10th September, 1904. Sappers of certain trades opened in April, 1905. Drivers reopened 1st May, 1905, generally.

Army—Long-Term Men available for Indian and Foreign Drafts.

MR. MARKS: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state what numbers of long-term men are available for the Indian and foreign drafts this autumn; what is the present total strength; and when recruiting for the home-service Army on the three years term is to be introduced.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The figures for the drafts for 1905–6 are as follows:—

	Total Nos. of 7, 8, and 9 years men at home, 1–6–05.	India and Tropical Colonies.			Other Colonies.		
		Drafts required.	No. of 7, 8, and 9 years men available.	Surplus or wanting.	Drafts required.	No. of 7, 8, and 9 years men available.	Surplus or wanting.
Cavalry - -	6,398	262	1,100	+938	215	1,170	+965
Artillery—							
Horse - -	983	215	476	+261	24	445	+421
Field - -	5,086	871	2,432	+1,561	416	2,200	+1,774
Garrison -	2,595	1,084	1,325	−241	1,033	1,270	+237
Infantry - -	17,495	11,826	8,052	−3,774	4,599	3,900	−699

The present total strength, rank and file, at home and abroad, is 227,971. As regards the last part of the Question, it is hoped that the recruiting for nine years will have sufficiently advanced to enable the introduction of the new short-service system towards the close of the year.

Army—Vacancies for Officers in Cavalry and Guards.

MR. MARKS: To ask the Secretary of State for War what are the total number of vacancies for officers in the various cavalry regiments and in His Majesty's Guards.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The vacancies on 8th July were as follows:—

Household Cavalry - -	2
Cavalry of the Line - -	64
Foot Guards - - -	28

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Flogging of Boys in the Navy.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the statements of the ill-treatment of boys on the training ship "Boscawen," submitted to him a few days ago, which statements were signed by the boy who was bought out of the Navy on account of such treatment, he will have the regulations so altered that corporals of training ships shall no longer be allowed to use or carry canes, and that no other corporal punishment shall be inflicted on boys except that of not more than twelve strokes with the birch, such birch to be constructed practically the same as those used in public schools, and that only one man shall be employed to flog one boy.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge): As this statement refers to irregularities which are alleged to have taken place in 1892 and 1893, it is not proposed to take any action in the matter. Ships' corporals are not allowed to carry canes. As regards the last part of the hon. Member's Question, I have nothing to add to what I have already said on the subject, both in debate and in reply to Questions.

Mr. HUNT: Was it not stated in 1892–3 that flogging with a birch pickled in brine was so severe that a boy had to be examined by the ship's doctor before he was birched, and after the birching had to be taken to the sick bay, and was there made a prisoner, and guarded from noon to sunset by a Marine to prevent him injuring himself.

Mr. PRETYMAN: I think these statements are considerably exaggerated, and I have nothing to add to the Answer already given.

Mr. HUNT: Is it the case now that the doctor is obliged to examine the boy before he is birched because the punishment is so severe that he is likely to faint?

Mr. PRETYMAN: Not because he is likely to faint, but because boys' constitutions vary, and precautions have to be taken.

Mr. HUNT: May I ask why boys, before being birched in a public school, do not have to be examined by a doctor?

*Mr. SPEAKER: No. That is an argumentative Question and should not be put.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): If a boy should shoot his bircher, would he be allowed to retire from the service?

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. BRIGHT (Shropshire, Oswestry): Are ship's corporals allowed to use the cane?

Mr. PRETYMAN: No, Sir.

Trincomali.

Major SEELY (Isle of Wight): On behalf of the hon. and gallant Member for the Heywood Division of Lancashire, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if it is intended to abandon the naval station at Trincomali.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the WAR OFFICE (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield): My hon. friend has asked me to say that this yard was closed in April last and will no longer be used in peace time. It can, however, be opened in war time should any special circumstances render this course necessary.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Have the guns been taken away, and have the buildings been handed over to caretakers?

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: No, Sir, the guns have not yet been taken away.

Major SEELY: On behalf of the hon. and gallant Member for the Heywood Division of Lancashire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if it is intended to abandon the military station at Trincomali; and if so, when, and for how long.

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: It is intended to abandon Trincomali for good, as soon as the troops can be withdrawn.

Mr. Van Rensburg.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that at the first meeting, in Heidelberg, of creditors in the insolvent estate of Mr. Van Rensburg, who recently resigned his seat as a nominated member of the Inter-Colonial Council, debts to the amount of £51,000 were proved, and included in the list was a sum of £20,000 due to the Colonial Treasurer of the Transvaal; and can he say for what purpose this loan was made.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): I have not yet received the information, but hope to do so shortly.

Mr. WHITLEY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that I first put the Question on the Paper three weeks ago?

Mr. LYTTELTON: We could not have obtained the information within that period unless we had cabled for it.

Mr. WHITLEY: Does not the right hon. Gentleman regard a debt of £20,000 due to the Colonial Treasurer of the Transvaal as a matter of importance?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I regard it as a matter of importance, but not as a matter of urgency.

Mr. WHITLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman now undertake to cable for the information?

Mr. LYTTELTON: No; I should not be justified in cabling for it.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman led my hon. friend to believe that an answer might be expected in a short time.

Mr. LYTTELTON: No.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: But my hon. friend postponed the Question for a week in the belief that the information would be obtained within that period.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I gave no encouragement to the hon. Member to put the Question down within a week. He used his own discretion.

Mr. WHITLEY: The right hon. Gentleman certainly gave me reason to believe that he would cable for the information. I will put the Question down again this day week.

Good Friday Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

Mr. BURT (Morpeth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the fact that fifteen European miners had been prosecuted for working on Good Friday in the Jumper's Deep Mine, contrary to the mining regulations, and to the evidence given that had they refused to work they would probably have been dismissed; and whether, seeing that each of the miners was fined £2, and that the law was not put in operation against the manager of the mine who had ordered the men to work, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

Mr. LYTTELTON: My attention has already been drawn to the newspaper report of this case. I have asked Lord Selborne for a report upon it, referring him particularly to the points raised in the Question of the hon. Member.

Uganda—Murder of Mr. Galt.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has received an account of the murder of a Sub-Commissioner near Entebbe, the capital of Uganda, and of any circumstances that may have led up to it.

Mr. LYTTELTON: Mr. Galt, the Assistant Secretary to the Administration of Uganda, was stabbed by a native in the evening of May 19th at Ibanda, which is about 140 miles east of Entebbe. He was at the time acting as Sub-Commissioner of the Western Province of the Protectorate. He died almost immediately after the attack. The Commissioner of Uganda has reported that the country round about Ibanda is peaceful and that the chiefs and people are well-disposed and quiet. He sees no political reason for the crime, which he regards as the act of an individual for purposes of revenge—possibly a dismissed employee or a discontented native. A complete investigation of the matter is being carried out.

Zionists in East Africa.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if the offer of territory made by the Foreign Office to the Zionists in East Africa has now been definitely accepted or declined.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The Answer to the hon. Member's Question is in the negative.

Partition of Bengal.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state the grounds upon which the Government decided to sanction the administrative proposals in regard to the partition of Bengal; whether he will lay Papers upon the Table with reference to the nature and extent of these changes, together with the correspondence relating thereto; and, if so, whether these Papers will be laid before the end of the present session.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The grounds on which the Government of India made the proposals, which have been accepted, will be gathered from the Papers which I propose to lay on the Table as soon as possible. Subject to what I may hear from the Government of India, I hope the Papers may be laid before the close of the session.

Press Censorship in India.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether a Press censorship has recently been established by the Government of India under which system correspondents are prevented from transmitting any item of news unfavourable to the Indian Government; and, if so, will he state the circumstances under which such a state of affairs has arisen, and say what steps, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. BRODRICK: I have no information as to the establishment of such a system as is described in the hon. Member's Question.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire?

MR. BRODRICK: I ought to have first some *prima facie* case to inquire into.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman on telegraphic terms with Lord Curzon?

Chinese Coolies in British North Borneo.

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the number of Chinese coolies employed on the respective tobacco estates in British North Borneo; and on what conditions they are engaged.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): Of the 13,000 adult Chinese in British North Borneo and Labuan about half are said to be employed on the tobacco and other estates. A very considerable number of those employed on the tobacco estates are "indentured coolies," who are, it is believed, engaged for three years at a fixed minimum salary which is increased on a certain scale in accordance with the care they exercise in looking after the tobacco in the field allotted to each man.

*MR. WEIR: Will the noble Lord give me a copy of the conditions of the contract?

EARL PERCY: We have no copy. They are private contracts.

*MR. WEIR: Are they not made by the British North Borneo Company?

EARL PERCY: They are made with private traders.

*MR. WEIR: I think I can show the noble Lord he is wrong.

London Traffic Commission Report.

SIR GEORGE BARTLEY (Islington, N.) asked when the Report of the London Traffic Commission would be issued. He reminded the Home Secretary that it was signed more than a fortnight ago and laid on the Table of the House last week?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I have not had notice of this Question, but I will inquire and let my hon. friend know the result. As far as I am concerned it will be issued at the first possible moment.

Bristol Carnival Lottery.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it has come to his knowledge that a lottery was held during a recent carnival at Bristol; and, if so, whether any action has been taken by the authorities with regard to it.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayreshire, N.): I am in communication with the Board of Trade and with the local police authorities in this matter, but I am not yet in a position to reply to the Question further than by referring the hon. Member to the statement made by the Duke of Marlborough in another place on the 29th of May † last.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Is it a fact that the Bishop of Bristol publicly denounced this lottery, and that the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant was one of the patrons?

[No Answer was returned.]

Hazel Grove (Cheshire) Disturbances.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state for how many hours on Saturday and Sunday the disturbance at Hazel Grove, Cheshire, continued; how many of the rioters can be identified by the police; how many were apprehended, in addition to the three persons arrested at the inception of the disturbance; and how many further prosecutions are to be instituted.

MR. COCHRANE: I am informed by the Chief Constable that on Saturday night the disorderly proceedings began about 11 o'clock, and lasted till about 3 a.m. On Sunday the crowd began to assemble about 9.30 p.m., and dispersed soon after midnight. The police have not identified any of the persons who took part in the disorderly proceedings, and the only arrests were those of the three persons mentioned in the Question. No further prosecutions are contemplated.

MR. MACVEAGH: Does the right hon. Gentleman mean to say that after two days rioting the police are not able to identify a single rioter?

MR. COCHRANE: I am afraid that is so.

MR. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrincham): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that three men were prosecuted, that the magistrate dismissed the case against two and that no evidence was offered against the other? Has an inquiry been instituted by the Standing Joint Committee of Cheshire as to the cause of the riots?

MR. COCHRANE: I must ask for notice of that.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Has the hon. Member who represents this constituency publicly denounced the conduct of these rioters?

[No Answer was returned.]

Motor-Car Drivers' Licences.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, with a view to prevent persons driving motor-cars and motor-cycles under the authority of licences which have been lent to them by the actual holders, he will consider the expediency of requiring all licence-holders to have their photographs printed on their licences.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The expediency of the requirement referred to will no doubt be considered by the Royal Commission which is to be appointed to inquire into the working of the Motor-Car Acts.

Motor-Car Speeds in the Parks.

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether he is aware that running trials and foot races are often held on the Mall and in the Park roads; that the speeds attained exceed ten miles an hour, and that horse-drawn carriages habitually exceed ten miles an hour between Marlborough Gate and Birdcage Walk; and, if so, will he say whether the speed limit of ten miles an hour applies to all persons and vehicles or to motor-cars only.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxlvii., 39.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): The reply to the first paragraph is in the negative; foot races are not held in the Royal parks except by permission, though occasionally persons may run through the parks. In reply to the second paragraph the First Commissioner is not aware that horse-drawn carriages habitually exceed ten miles an hour; on the contrary, tests which he has caused to be made show the reverse to be the case. The limit of speed to ten miles per hour does not apply to persons who walk or run, or to vehicles other than motor-cars, there being other rules for the regulation of such traffic.

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU: Will the noble Lord lay on the Table details of the tests taken as regards horse-drawn vehicles? I have tested them, and have found that they do exceed ten miles an hour.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not think that necessary. No doubt carriages do occasionally exceed ten miles an hour, but we have no reason whatever to suppose the hon. Member is correct when he says they habitually do so.

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU: Will notice be taken of the cases in which they do?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Of course, if it is to the danger of the public.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the driver of a horse-drawn vehicle is liable to be imprisoned for two years if he drives to the danger of the public?

MR. FLAVIN: And can the right hon. Gentleman name any foot-racer whose speed exceeds ten miles an hour?

[No Answer was returned.]

Scottish Fishery Cruiser "Norna."

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if he will state what sum was realised by the sale of the Fishery Board cruiser "Norna;" and in what respect was she found unsuitable for the service.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): Five hundred and fifty pounds was realised by the sale of the "Norna." Owing to the size and design of the vessel she was not well adapted to face the rough weather which the fishery cruisers have frequently to cope with in superintending the fisheries.

Rates in the Western Hebrides.

MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness): I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if his attention has been drawn to the increase of the rates in the Western Hebrides, amounting as they do in the parish of South Uist to over 12s. per pound, in the parish of Barra to over 13s. per pound, while in some parishes in the Lewes they amount to 17s. per pound; and whether, in view of this state of matters, with the prospect of still further increase, he will consider whether something can be done, by legislation or otherwise, to meet the hardship inflicted upon the districts.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: My attention has been drawn to the growing burden of the rates in the parishes referred to by the hon. Member. The Secretary for Scotland is fully conscious of the gravity of the state of matters which now exists and which is engaging his serious consideration, but he cannot undertake to introduce any legislative proposals at present.

MR. WEIR: Will the Government press forward the Congested Districts Bill, which has now been introduced four years in succession?

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: I am afraid the opposition to it comes chiefly from the hon. Member's own friends.

MR. WEIR: Then is the Government afraid of the Motion standing in the name of the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark?

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: We are not afraid; but we cannot get time to discuss it.

MR. WEIR: Go on. For four years you have had a chance.

Dog Poisoning at Sneem

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that six dogs have been poisoned in the village of Sneem within the past few months; and whether the police are taking any steps to put down a practice which has been in operation within the last two years.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): Four dogs have been poisoned in Sneem within the past few months. The police have done everything in their power to trace the offender, but detection in such cases is obviously difficult.

Evicted Farms.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners can treat an unoccupied evicted farm as a separate estate when such farm only includes a small portion of the entire lands owned by a landlord; and, if so, or in any event, have the Commissioners up to the present taken, or do they propose in future to take, any steps for the reinstatement of evicted tenants in such cases without incurring the delay arising until all the lands on the estates on which such unoccupied farms are come before them for sale.

MR. WALTER LONG: The amending Act of 1904 enables the Estates Commissioners to define land wholly or partly untenanted as an estate. Beyond pointing out that fact, I cannot give any opinion on this abstract question of law.

The Militia.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in the event of his considering the propriety of giving further facilities for considering Volunteer questions, he will bear in mind the like interests of the Militia forces.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have already explained that the amount of time given to Army discussion in Supply only affords one more day for dealing with the Army Votes. That day has been allocated, at the request of the Leader of the Opposition, to the discussion of the Volunteer Vote in the first place, and to the discussion of the Secretary of State's salary in the second place. If there is any time for discussion later, I shall be glad to bear my hon. friend's request in mind.

MR. FLYNN said Lord Roberts had since made an important declaration in another place.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know that that has any bearing on the order in which we should take the Votes on Thursday.

Method of Taking Divisions.

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has considered the time occupied by divisions taken under the present system; and whether he will appoint a Committee to consider whether a saving of time can be effected by mechanical means of recording votes, to the relief also of the discomfort to Members during divisions.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The length of time taken by divisions, and the amount thus substracted from discussion, has forced itself upon the attention of the Government, and I am sure it has forced itself upon the attention of every Gentleman in this House. But nobody has yet suggested a practical scheme for modifying it, and I do not think the mechanical methods adopted in foreign Assemblies would be practicable in this House, where Members have not got fixed seats, and where there are obvious difficulties to be overcome which are not met with in the Chambers of which I speak. Certainly the time taken by divisions is a factor which cannot be left out of account by those interested in the progress of business and who prefer discussion to walking through the lobbies. Although I cannot afford hope, nor make any suggestion on the subject, it may be that the time will come when some ingenious person will find a solution of the real difficulties to which my hon. friend has called attention.

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU: Is it not desirable that some inquiry should be held? Assuming that each division occupies a quarter of an hour, there is a waste of ten days of Parliamentary time in the course of a session.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I trust that, whatever happens, the Prime Minister will not listen to any suggestion from the hon. Gentleman opposite for the use of motor-cars.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I must say I wish there was less interference with the speed limit in the matter of divisions. When my hon. friend points out that divisions take ten days of Parliamentary time, it is well to remember that was the exact amount given to the whole of the legislation of the Government at the time when I moved mv Motion last week.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: That is no credit to your leadership.

MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes) asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether he would consider the possibility of reverting to the method of taking divisions which was introduced under the auspices of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon some years ago.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not refreshed my memory as to the details of my right hon. friend's proposal; but, as far as I remember, there were found to be practical difficulties in its working, and I should be sorry to commit myself to it without further examination.

Political Pressure by Civil Servants.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if and when he intends to appoint a Parliamentary Committee to inquire into the best method of giving consideration to the claims for increased remuneration of Civil servants without danger of political pressure being applied to Members.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: This is a very important matter and is engaging the attention of the Government, but I am not yet in a position to make any statement on the subject.

Ministerial Answers.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL desired to call the attention of the Speaker to what he conceived to be an abuse of the rules of the House. Yesterday, when the time limit for Questions had arrived, there were three Questions on the Paper addressed to the Prime Minister which were not answered by him. He submitted that, under the rules of the House, it was the bounden duty of the right hon. Gentleman to supply written Answers to those Questions and circulate them in the Votes and Proceedings, but he had not done so. He wished to ask the Speaker what remedy hon. Members had against this evasion of answering Questions by the Prime Minister.

*MR. SPEAKER: This matter was discussed last week, when, I think, the hon. Member put to me almost identically the same Question. I then said that the rules provided no remedy but that it was the duty of the Minister whose Questions were not reached to hand the Answers in at the Table of the House. I would point out to the hon. Member that very often it happens that, by reason of the great number of supplementary Questions, the Questions on the printed Paper are not reached.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR pointed out that arrangements had been made, which were almost invariably successful, that Questions addressed to him should come on at a time when he could answer them. He thought there were seventeen addressed to him yesterday, and he was on his legs for thirty-five or forty minutes answering them. There would have been no difficulty in answering the three Questions referred to by the hon. Member but for the large number of supplementary Questions, for he greatly preferred answering Questions orally. The hon. Member apparently suggested that he wished to evade Questions. He should have thought the hon. Member had had enough experience of the operation of putting Questions and of the operation of receiving Answers to know that there was no desire for evasion on his part. He did not feel at all guilty in that respect. He did feel guilty in not having given written Answers to the Questions which were not reached.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Very well; the right hon. Gentleman will not offend again.

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNTY OF LONDON ELECTRIC BILL.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked the Chairman of the Committee of Selection whether the Committee appointed to consider the Bill of the Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company were nominated and the Members advised of their selection before the Second Reading of the Bill; whether his attention had been called to the fact that two of the hon. Members so nominated afterwards voted in favour of the Second Reading of the Bill, and whether the Committee of Selection had received an intimation from one other Member that he was financially interested in the scheme, and whether, in the circumstances, the Committee of Selection proposed to take any further steps with regard to the formation of this Committee.

Mr. HALSEY (Hertfordshire, Watford) replied that the Committee were appointed provisionally by the Committee of Selection before the Second Reading of the Bill, but the names were not announced until after the Second Reading. This was done with the object of allowing the Committee to meet at the earliest possible moment, which, in view of the importance of the Bill and the lateness of the session, was thought desirable. It was not unusual to appoint a Committee to sit on a group of Bills some of which had not been read a second time. He was aware that two Members voted in favour of the Bill being read a second time; but it had never been held that a Member voting in favour of a Bill going to a Committee should be in consequence unable to sit as a member of the Committee on the Bill, though, naturally, a Member having voted against the Second Reading would not be eligible. No Member would be able to sit on the Committee who had not first signed the declaration stating that neither he nor his constituents had any personal or local interest in the Bill referred to them.

Mr. LOUGH said the right hon. Gentleman had not answered that part of his Question in which he asked whether any communication had been received from one of the Members nominated.

Mr. HALSEY said that was not so. One of the Members who were originally nominated on the Committee had asked to be excused, not on that ground, but on private and personal grounds. He had not received any intimation from any of the hon. Members that he was financially interested in the scheme.

Mr. BOULNOIS (Marylebone, E.) asked whether the hon. Members named by the Selection Committee knew that they had been nominated before the Second Reading of the Bill.

Mr. HALSEY said he was not quite sure of that. The hon. Member who had been appointed Chairman of the Committee was aware that he would be nominated and that it was proposed to appoint him the Chairman, but he was not quite certain about the other Members.

Mr. LOUGH asked the Speaker whether he thought it was desirable that members of a Committee of this kind, dealing with such an important matter, should pledge themselves by voting on the Second Reading of the Bill which was to be referred to them.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I think that is not a Question that comes within my jurisdiction. I may have my own private views with regard to it, but it is not for me to impose them on the House.

Mr. RUTHERFORD (Lancashire, Darwen) desired to state, as one of the Members nominated, that he knew nothing about his nomination when the Second Reading of the Bill was voted upon.

Sir J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College) said he was asked whether he could serve on the Committee before the Second Reading, and in spite of that he voted in the division. It never occurred to him to do otherwise, for he could not conceive how his action on the Committee could be affected by his voting for the Second Reading.

NEW BILLS.

IRISH EDUCATION (AFFLICTED CHILDREN) BILL.

"To make better provision for the Elementary Education of Afflicted Children in Ireland," presented by Mr. Walter Long; supported by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 269.]

MUSICAL COPYRIGHT BILL.

"To provide further remedies for preventing the infringement of Musical Copyright," presented by Mr. Cochrane; supported by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas, Mr. Attorney-General, and Mr. Solicitor-General; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 270.]

ALIENS (EXPENSES).

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salary and remuneration of any officers, inspectors, or persons appointed under any Act of the present session to amend the Law with regard to Aliens, and of any expenses incurred in carrying such Act into effect."

Resolution read a second time.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) begged to move to add at the end of the Motion the words "not exceeding in all in any one year, £10,000." He had put in the words "in all," because he saw, after re-reading the Resolution laid on the Table, that it might otherwise be held to refer only to the expenses and not to the salaries of those whom it was proposed to appoint. On several occasions they had endeavoured to raise the question of the expense arising in connection with the Bill, and he was afraid that this was the only opportunity, in view of the fact that the guillotine had come into force, that they would have of saying anything on the financial aspect of the question. He had put in a limit of £10,000 a year for the expenditure, and that would allow for an average of £1,200 for each of the eight ports at which it was proposed to set up machinery under the Bill. The element of expenditure was a substantial element in the consideration of the measure. They were now well aware that the number of aliens that they were going to keep out of this country was likely to be extremely small. Some of his hon. friends put it at thirty or forty, while others suggested it might be about 100, and adopting the latter figure he thought it would be admitted that the allocation of £10,000 a year in order to exclude 100 undesirable aliens was a very liberal—even a lavish—provision to make. He wished to enter his protest against granting the Home Secretary unlimited credit in this matter. He thought that they ought to have some definite limit placed on the expenditure to be authorised under the Bill, and in the vague form in which Clause 4 was now drafted it was clear that there was absolutely no limit whatever on the discretion of the right hon. Gentleman. There was nothing to say how many officers he might appoint or at what salary, and, in fact, he might spend anything from £10,000 to £100,000 a year. Of course, he would tell them that the Treasury would look after that, but in late years their trust in the Treasury had substantially diminished, for they had seen over and over again that, after entering a half-hearted protest against expenditure, it had given way, and schemes of lavish and unnecessary outlay had been sanctioned. Under these circumstances he begged to move his Amendment.

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) seconded the Amendment. He said he believed that at an earlier stage of the discussion the Home Secretary gave them a rough estimate of the expenditure under the Bill, and he put it at £24,000 a year. They had no knowledge, however, upon what that was based, for the right hon. Gentleman did not go into detail. He would like, however, to call the attention of the House to the fact that on the preceding day two things occurred which made it pretty clear that the expenditure under the Bill should not be very large if only the Government exercised economy. They had two discussions on the previous day of a very important character. One was on the question of contract labour. There was an Amendment to exclude contract labour, which was brought forward by the Labour Members of the House. It was the only one, he believed, they had introduced, and it was promptly rejected by the Government. That Amendment would have excluded contract labour, and its rejection had brought about a very material difference between the law which was to be put into operation in England and the law which was already in operation in America. It was the case, he understood, that the number of aliens excluded from America in the course of the year was 8,000, and of these no fewer than 1,500 were excluded under the clause which permitted contract labourers to be kept out of the country, and, therefore, in England, when they were calculating how many people were likely to be excluded under this Act, they would have to take into consideration that it would be infinitely less than the American standard, because there would be no power to exclude contract labour. But the other decision arrived at on the previous night was of an even more formidable character. The House was asked to permit victims of religious persecution to come freely into this country. One thing was perfectly certain, and that was that enormous numbers of those who came over here from Russia and Poland were victims of religious persecution, and the result of the decision of the Government on this matter was that the greater part of the poverty-stricken people who now came to this country would necessarily be excluded, because, as was well known, they were the victims of religious persecution. So far as numbers were concerned, the bottom had been knocked out of the Bill. The result was that the great changes which the Bill was to work would become extremely small. There would, indeed, be very few people excluded, and if £24,000 was to be the cost of the administration of the measure as it was originally framed, he ventured to think that the sum of £10,000 would now become an extravagant estimate, if only the Government would work it in an economical spirit, and he would urge upon them to try to make the Bill a little less unpopular by not putting too severe a strain upon the Treasury.

Amendment proposed—

"At end, to add the words "not exceeding in all in any one year ten thousand pounds."—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said he could not agree with the mover and seconder of the Amendment as to the desirability of narrowing the effect of the money clause. He thought the last speaker must have overlooked the fact that the sole purpose of the Bill was not to exclude, but that it was also proposed to examine immigrants, and that such examination must necessarily involve considerable expense, not only in regard to the salaries of the officers engaged, but also in regard to the accommodation which it might be necessary to put up for the temporary detention of aliens. This Amendment was practically a vote of want of confidence in the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, and he was not prepared to vote for it, because the right hon. Gentleman had been extremely conciliatory towards shipowners. He had smiled upon them in the most amiable manner, and had accompanied that smile by substantial concessions. He took this opportunity, however, to bring before the right hon. Gentleman one point which was raised by an Amendment of an hon. friend which, with many other Amendments, would fail to be discussed, an Amendment which protested in the strongest terms against placing on the shipowners the burden of providing the accommodation necessary for the detention of immigrants. In the Bill of last year there were words which enabled the Secretary of State, with the sanction of the Treasury, to provide such accommodation as might be required at any port, and he hoped that it would be found possible to introduce similar words into this measure. It was quite impossible to forecast the cost of working this Bill, and if it were found necessary to erect substantial buildings a very considerable proportion of the sum estimated would be required for that purpose. He objected to the cost of the buildings, which was small, being placed upon the shipowners, inasmuch as the Bill was intended to exclude aliens for the benefit and safety of the country at large. Under these circumstances, he hoped the Amendment would be rejected, that a free hand would be given to the Home Secretary, and that the right hon. Gentleman would do the right thing by the shipowners, which he was sure he was desirous of doing.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said the hon. Member, in expressing a willingness to sanction unbridled, unlimited, and extravagant expenditure, provided that the shipowner was "squared," was hardly treating the Committee with sufficient courtesy. The Resolution as it stood was as wide as the wide world, and that no limit was imposed in the clause was, in his opinion, a grave defect. The better, and not unusual, practice of the House was to have a limit put in the Resolution itself. He understood that his right hon. friend the Home Secretary had suggested that he could do the job of keeping out 100 aliens or so for £24,000 per annum, or about £240 per alien. He suggested that the limit should be, not £10,000, but £24,000, and he put that forward as a happy suggestion that would reconcile the objection of both sides.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said the question of cost was a very serious one. There were not only officials to be appointed, but buildings and offices which had to be provided. He noticed, too, that provision was to be made for returns. But they already had very complete returns, and why should they give the Home Secretary a blank cheque in order to do work at present well done by the Board of Trade. He would like to ask whether the Home Secretary would undertake that before any expenses were incurred under the Bill the estimates should be laid before the House.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The Government cannot spend any money until it is voted by the House.

MR. WHITLEY: Does the hon. Gentleman mean to say that the Government cannot, for instance, appoint the immigration officers until we vote the money?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: If they do appoint them we need not pay.

MR. LOUGH urged that the House had a right to express some opinion as to the class of the men to be appointed as officers and as to the pay to be given them, and he pressed for a pledge that no appointment should be made without the House being first consulted.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) said he could give no such promise as that which the hon. Member for Islington asked for. A more unreasonable proposal had never been made to a Minister. He had already stated that the Home Office had made a careful estimate of the expenses that would be incurred under the Bill, and the figure arrived at was £24,000 a year. That estimate was made up by allowing £3,000 for the Port of London, £2,000 for each of the other ten ports at which it was proposed to set up the machinery required by the Bill, and £1,000 for central staff. The hon. Member for the Elland Division had contended that the estimate was excessive as the bottom had been knocked out of the Bill yesterday by the agreement to admit the victims of religious persecution. On the contrary, it would increase the expenditure by entailing a closer examination of the aliens to ascertain whether they came within that exemption. He did not accept the estimate formed on the Opposition Benches as to the small number of aliens which the Bill would exclude. He believed the Bill would keep out the large number of undesirable immigrants who came here because they were rejected in America; and as the knowledge of the operation of the Bill spread abroad the number of aliens coming here would be reduced and with it the cost of the machinery of the Bill.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the buildings required for the accommodation and examination of aliens be provided for by Estimate or will there be an Aliens Loans Bill.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I have no intention of anything in the form of an Aliens Loans Bill. We believe that the buildings which will be required for carrying out the Bill are already provided at the harbours and docks, but if any shipping companies desire other buildings they certainly will be called upon to provide them.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said it was impossible for the House to arrive at the probable number of aliens who would be stopped under the Bill until they knew the number of aliens who at present came intending to stay here.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): 75,000 a year.

Mr. BRYCE said the House had no statistics on the point of the slightest value, although they had repeatedly asked for them. The evidence of the man who knew most about it—Mr. Llewellyn Smith—went to show that it was impossible for the Board of Trade to give any estimate. The Home Secretary had entirely failed to give an estimate of the probable number of aliens, and, therefore, they were discussing this most important matter absolutely in the dark. On the question of expense the Home Secretary had stimulated rather than satisfied curiosity. The right hon. Gentleman had put forward an estimate of £24,000 for eleven ports, but the only particulars he had given were £3,000 for London, £2,000 for other ports, and £1,000 for the Home Office. How were the other £11,000 to be spent?

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: £2,000 for each of the other ten ports.

Mr. BRYCE asked how the money at the different ports was to be expended. There would have to be inspectors, but what salaries were to be paid, and were the officers to do any work other than that in connection with aliens? In many ports there would be so little work that it would be absurd to appoint an inspector exclusively for the duty, and in such cases would existing officials of the Board of Trade undertake the work as an extra duty? If special officers were appointed would care be taken to see that they possessed the necessary qualifications? These were all Questions that should be asked now, since, owing to the conditions under which the Bill was being discussed, there would be no opportunity on the appropriate portions of the measure. Personally, he could not see how the £24,000 were to be spent. At most of the ports so few aliens came in that it would be neither reasonable nor proper to employ men at considerable salaries to do a trifling piece of work which would become important only once or twice a week, if then. He thought his hon. friend's estimate would be much nearer the mark than that of the Home Secretary, and certainly £24,000 was a large sum to spend in demonstrating the utter inutility and absurdity of the measure.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) asked whether the estimate of expenditure under the Bill would be submitted in the form of a Supplementary Estimate before the close of the present session, seeing that the Bill would come into force on January 1st next.

Mr. BRIGHT (Shropshire, Oswestry) said that as the Home Secretary had referred to an Answer given to him it was as well that the House should know the exact wording of that Answer, since it hardly bore the construction now placed upon it. The Answer was—

> "It is obvious that any estimate which can be made at the present moment must be to a great extent conjectural. I have, however, prepared an estimate of the probable cost of administration, confining it to the provisions for preventing the immigration of undesirables, since it is impossible to forecast the expense of expelling alien criminals, etc.";

therefore there would be expenditure over and above the £24,000, and the House had a right to know what exactly was included in this sum. The only effect of the measure would be to damage us as a freedom-loving nation in the eyes of the world, and to throw a considerable burden on the taxpayer.

Mr. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.) asked upon whom the cost of providing additional buildings would fall in the event of such additional buildings being found necessary. It would be extremely unfair that it should fall on the shipowners, Last year the Government proposed that the cost of providing accommodation for the temporary detention of aliens should be borne by the nation, and he failed to see why a different course should be followed this year. The cost to employers under our system of inspection and so forth was continually increasing, and, while he did not say that such inspection was wrong, he thought it would soon become necessary for the Government to do something to assist employers to bear this constantly increasing burden.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland) said that probably many hon. Members thought that this £24,000 was a mere trifle compared with the saving to the rates that would be effected by the exclusion of aliens. That, however, was not the case. According to the Board of Trade Report alien pauperism represented 0·22 per cent. of the total pauperism of the country. The total cost of pauperism in England and Wales was about £13,000,000, 0·22 per cent. of which represented roughly £28,000. Therefore the country was asked to spend £24,000 upon a system of inspection the maximum result of which, if it kept out all alien paupers, would be to save £28,000.

MR. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale) was understood to say that the Home Secretary was suffering from going too far in his endeavours to conciliate opponents of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman ought not to commit himself to any definite amount, as it was impossible to say what the precise expense would be. As far as Liverpool was concerned, the machinery was already in existence, and it would cost little, if anything, to put the Bill into operation, especially having regard to the probable saving to the rates. In London the case was different. Out of 51,000 aliens who arrived in the Metropolis last year 49,000 arrived in foreign steamers. In different ports different conditions and requirements obtained. He desired to dissociate himself from the remarks of some of his hon. friends, as he thought it was doing an ill service to the cause of shipowners to put forward unreasonable claims.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR asked why that was unreasonable this year which, in the opinion of the Government, was perfectly reasonable last year.

MR. DAVID MACIVER said that being a shipowner he would naturally be unwilling that any unreasonable charge should be imposed upon shipowners, but he thought it only right that those whose trade it was to bring aliens to this country should be responsible for any additional cost that might be involved.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said he desired to press the point as to the problematical cost to the shipowners of providing the accommodation which would be necessary under this Bill. This question could not be dismissed in the light and airy fashion which had been adopted by the Home Secretary. Heavy charges would have to be met at the seaports, notwithstanding what had been said by the hon. Member for Liverpool. He would like to know where was there accommodation in Liverpool that could be used for the influx of immigrants who would have to be examined and supervised, either medically or otherwise. So far as Liverpool was concerned, every small building was used, and they were of very great value. To suggest that shipowners were to provide the necessary accommodation and purchase land in order to provide something which was to be used for a national purpose was putting a very heavy expense upon them. There seemed to be no limit to the expense that might have to be borne in the carrying out of this Bill. The Home Secretary was asking for a blank cheque to pay whatever salaries and expenses he liked, and that was certainly not a business-like arrangement. The right hon. Gentleman ought to tell them the amount he proposed to spend and give the House some details that would enable them to form a judgment.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent) said he thought this Bill was very popular with the working classes, but it was not advisable that they should get it into their heads that it was going to be a costly Bill. He thought the Home

Secretary would be well advised if he put a limit into the Bill which must not be exceeded. He could not see why the American method had not been adopted and so much charged for each immigrant. Either the people who brought these immigrants or the immigrants themselves should be called upon to pay these charges.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) said he trusted that the Home Secretary would remain quite firm upon the point of expenditure connected with the accommodation of these immigrants. He could not understand why there should be any suggestion that the taxpayers should pay these charges. Here they had a number of shipping companies, mostly foreigners, dragging into their net anybody they could and bringing them over here in order to make a profit. Why on earth should not these shipping companies pay the expense of these examinations? He did not see why the reasonable restrictions imposed upon other parts of shipping should not also be applied in regard to this particular part of their business. In London, foreign shipowners had the option of having these people examined on board ship, and in that case they would not be put to any expense. If shipowners only took proper precautions in selecting their passengers they would be subjected to hardly any inconvenience at all. If shipowners chose to bring undesirable people and chance them being rejected the blame would rest upon themselves. In the debate last evening hon. Members opposite offered no objection to the financial burden which the granting of asylum to foreigners would place upon this country. At any rate, he hoped the burden of these immigrants would be removed from the people of the East End of London and other localities who were being so seriously injured under the present system. In Hamburg there was an enormous business of this kind, and they had set up depots there costing £50,000 without any question of the State bearing any of the cost. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would adhere to his original proposal.

*MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) complained of the statements made, more particularly by the hon. and gallant Member for Stepney, that shipping companies engaged in bringing immigrants were employed in casting their net over Europe, raking in any person good, bad, or indifferent, to swell their passenger lists.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON: Hear, hear!

MR. RUNCIMAN: Could that be said of the port of Hull, where the only passenger vessels coming in with these aliens belonged to the well-known Wilson Line? Would the hon. Member make that distinct accusation against the Wilson Line that they cast their net all over Europe, raking in good, bad, and indifferent Had the hon. Member made a similar accusation against the Great Central Railway Company at Grimsby and the Lancashire and Yorkshire Company at Goole, and did he say that most of this business on the Tyne which was carried on by English companies was not honourably performed? They were reckless accusations made by an amateur investigator who had been gulled in nearly every country of Europe, and they did nothing to strengthen the cause he was advocating. He was, however, not so much concerned with the hon. Member, because, after all, it was the Government with whom they had to deal. The Home Secretary had given them £24,000 as a probable estimate of the cost. Would the right hon. Gentleman accept £24,000 as the limit, and place words to that effect in the Resolution. It had been suggested that £2,000 might be spent upon the Tyne, but that sum was absolutely unreasonable. On the Tyne only a small number of the vessels carried immigrants, and £2,000 would be sufficient to pay £200 a year to each member of the immigration board and seven officers. With seven officers on the Tyne there would be six of them on six days of the week who would have nothing to do but twiddle their thumbs. The sum of £2,000 for Leith and Grimsby was totally unreasonable. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman would be very safe in limiting the expenditure to £24,000.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, speaking again with the permission of the House, said that the Government had taken a safe figure in estimating the cost of the working of the Act. He would much rather do that than understate the figure and then be told that he had put forward a plan and got the House to agree to it on an estimate which had afterwards to be made very much larger. He admitted that the sum proposed was large for certain ports, but they must be on the safe side. It was not usual to go into detailed figures on a Resolution of this sort. He could assure the House that the figures were based on estimates which had been made of the possible cost of the machinery of the Act. He had been rather rash sometimes in endeavouring to meet the wishes of the House by giving information as to details and he had found that this led to lengthened debates afterwards. He did not propose to place a large amount on the Estimates for permanent staff, but he believed that the figure he had quoted was the limit. It was likely that a smaller figure would be sufficient. It was impossible to estimate the amount that might be required for the deportation of aliens. The estimate he had given had been closely made, having regard to the number of officials who would be required and the actual salaries to be paid. He had only been anxious to deal with an outside figure.

Mr. CHURCHILL (Oldham) said that in view of the right hon. Gentleman's statement the Amendment proposed by his hon. friend was very reasonable.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he had already stated that they could not say how many aliens would have to be deported.

Mr. CHURCHILL said the right hon. Gentleman had stated that it was impossible to give a definite figure. He had, therefore, selected a figure which erred on the side of generosity. However vague their information might be on this subject, he understood that £24,000 was the utmost limit of expense to which the country would be put. If that was so why not insert that limit? He was perfectly sure that the mover of the Amendment would agree to that limit.

Mr. WHITLEY said if the Home Secretary would agree to that he would be willing to withdraw the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 157; Noes, 224. (Division List No. 263.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Austin, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt. E. C. S Andrw's Bghs
Ellis; John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, N.E
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp

Hutchinson, Dr. CharlesFredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif, (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan,W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen
Morley, Rt.Hn.John (Montrose
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.
Nolan, Joseph Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, W.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond John E. (Waterford
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith. Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donald
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George(York, W.R.)
Wilson, Chas. Henr— (Hull,W
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk,Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.N.
Woodhouse, SirJT.(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. J. H. Whitley and Mr. Trevelyan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn.SirH.
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(Manch'ter
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, SirFrancisT.(Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. AllenBenjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bingham, Lord
Bond, Edward
Bowles,Lt.-Col.H.F.(Middlesex
Brymer, William Ernest
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles Willson
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.JA(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Chas. Alf.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt.Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt.Hon.SirJohnE.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison, York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, RtHn.AilwynEdw.
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Man'cr
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Winlay, SirRB.(Inv'rn'ssBghs'
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Grevill, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, Sir James(StaffordsNW
Heaton, John Henniker
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brighstide
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol S
Lowe, Francis William
Lloyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fredk. G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Col Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, Wiliam Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, H C. (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Rt. Hn. J. Parker (Lan'ks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt, Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Younger, William.

Tellers for the Noes—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Viscount Valentia.

Resolution agreed to.

ALIENS BILL,

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R. Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 4:—

Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) said that the Amendment he had to move stood in the name of four hon. Members on that side and two on the Government side of the House. He observed that the Home Secretary had given notice of a very important Amendment on this sub-section, and if the right hon. Gentleman had not done so he would have had a very easy case to show the great hardship which the clause, as it stood, would inflict on the shipping trade. He thought it was scandalous that the Government should have suggested that the master or owner of a ship should undertake the task of deporting an immigrant who had been allowed to enter into this country. No fault could be imputed to the master or the owner; if any fault was to be imputed it should be to the immigration officer who had allowed the immigrant to land. He would not go further into the monstrous proposition contained in the Bill as it stood; but he presumed he would be in order in discussing the sub-section as it would be altered when the Amendment to be proposed by the Home Secretary was carried.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. Member cannot do that until the Amendment is proposed.

Mr. EMMOTT said that he would, then, best consult the convenience of the Committee by simply pointing out what a monstrous proposition this was in the Bill as originally drawn. He formally moved.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 39, to leave out Subsection (2)."—(*Mr. Emmott.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'If an expulsion order be made in the case of any alien' stand part of the clause."

Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said he would ask the Home Secretary to reconsider this clause. He quite recognised that the right hon. Gentleman had put an Amendment on the Paper which would to some considerable extent meet the objection referred to by the hon. Member for Oldham. His own objection to the clause was that it was fundamentally wrong in principle. It proceeded on the supposition that a shipmaster who had brought an immigrant into the United Kingdom, which immigrant had been wrongfully admitted, was to be responsible for the good behaviour of that immigrant for six months and then return him free to the port of embarkation. A shipmaster was not gifted with prescience or the power of reading the secret thoughts of a passenger on his ship; and how could he tell what that passenger was going to do during the ensuing six months? He must protest against some remarks that had been made from his own side of the House as to the responsibility of the shipping trade in this matter. The immigrant trade was a legitimate trade, and, if it was to be interfered with for the benefit of the public at large no disadvantage should be thrown on the shipmaster or owner. He was glad that the Government was showing a conciliatory spirit on this point, and the concession made by the Home Secretary to meet the views of the shipping trade had given some satisfaction; but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would again look at this provision with the view of making a further concession to the shipmaster who himself had no power to refuse an immigrant. Supposing a shipmaster had left his old employer, was he to be followed up and held responsible for the behaviour of an immigrant over whom he had no control and who had been passed by the immigration officer? Shipmasters were not represented in that Assembly, and on that account they had a right to considerate treatment. He asked the Home Secretary, if he could not remove this provision altogether, to join the agent and owner in responsibility with the shipmaster.

Mr. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) said he did not know what steps the Home Secretary proposed in order to recover from the master of a ship all the heavy liability it was proposed to impose upon him. He admired the ingenuity of the right hon. Gentleman, but why should it not proceed further? Why should not a cabman be responsible for a drunk or disorderly fare; and why should not the right hon. Gentleman be responsible for breaches of the Factory Acts? The sub-section seemed to be a rough and ready means of shifting responsibility. The Bill proposed to impose so many extraordinary provisions that a little injustice here and there would not be noticed by the public, and they would get accustomed to it. As the sub-section stood, it would make the master an accessory before the fact in the event of crime being committed.

Mr. CHURCHILL (Oldham) said that the Amendment on the Paper conceded the whole substance of the words the right hon. Gentleman proposed to leave out. It was admitted that 92 per cent. of the immigrants entered the principal ports; and, as far as that proportion was concerned, there would be no liability on the part of the shipmaster. On the other hand, the master of a ship would be liable for aliens landed at other ports. That seemed to him very unusual; and, in his opinion, destroyed the great safeguard which the right hon. Gentleman desired. Did the right hon. Gentleman seriously mean that the shipmaster should be responsible for a foreigner he brought into this country. He did not believe that the Government intended to make themselves responsible for such a proposition. The right hon. Gentleman had given away one handle he had over the shipping companies; and, at the same time, left this absurd anomaly in his Bill. Was it worth while to proceed with the rest of the clause which imposed on shipmasters such an unjust liability? Take the case of a cabin passenger who crossed from Calais to Dover. There would be no record regarding him. By what conceivable method could the chain of responsibility be established? He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that the purpose of the Bill would not be altered if the words proposed to be left out were omitted.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) said that there were other reasons for the retention of the sub-section than those which had been alluded to.

*MR. CHARLES WILSON (Hull, W.) said that in his opinion this sub-section went much further than the Home Secretary imagined. He would remind the Committee that on a modern ship there was plenty of work for the shipmaster to do without having the additional obligation of looking after immigrants or transmigrants on board. If the sub-section remained in the Bill the result would be that that master might be liable not for one immigrant but for, perhaps, a hundred of them. That fact, surely, showed the absurdity ot the proposal. He did not believe that the Home Secretary wished to do anything to damage the shipping trade of this country; but why all these traps for the shipowners and masters? This sort of legislation practically put the shipowners in the hands of the surveyors, and he could say from his own experience that a shipowner in such hands had a very bad time indeed. The Government were going to give one or two millions to the Cunard Company to build some of the finest ships in the world; and these ships would probably carry fifteen hundred or two thousand passengers. How was it possible for the shipmaster to know the peculiarities of all these people? The shipmaster was also to be responsible for taking expelled aliens back to their country of origin. What was he to do with them if they were refused readmission? Apparently he and they would be in the case of the Flying Dutchman, and have to go backwards and forwards for ever. The measure was full of absurdities, anomalies, and unnecessary restrictions. He hoped the Government would recognise the difficulties which the sub-section would place them and the shipowners and masters in, and would omit it.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said he admitted that the Home Secretary had endeavoured to meet the difficulties of the situation. What was the position? The alien who was landed in this country before the passage of the Act was, of course, the property of the country. Then as regarded the alien who was admitted by an immigration officer, there was not the slightest reason why he should be thrown as a charge on the shipowner. But there was another class which did not arrive by immigrant ships. In the case of a first-class passenger from Calais to Dover, it was impossible for a shipmaster to protect himself. In three months such a passenger might be a lunatic; or in the case of a woman a prostitute. He entirely agreed w th his hon. friend and colleague the Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool, that this clause was very hard on the shipping companies. They had made representations to the right hon. Gentleman, and he had met them to a large extent, but he still thought that if this sub-section was taken out altogether it would do the Bill no harm.

MR. EMMOTT said he desired to put three cases to the Attorney-General. The first case was the case of the cabin passenger who came over from Calais to Dover, was subsequently, within six months, convicted of crime, and against whom an expulsion order was made. Would the owners of the Dover-Calais steamer have to take that man back? Would they have to pay any bill which the Home Secretary chose to present to them, or for the cost of the man's custody after he had been adjudged guilty of that crime? If so, did the Home Secretary consider that it was a proper and reasonable change to make in the law? The second case was that of a man who came in a ship which was not an immigrant ship and who had been convicted of some crime and become, even for an odd week, a pauper—or who had been for a few days a vagrant, and against whom an expulsion order was made. Was it a proper thing that that man should be carried back by the master of the ship which brought him — perhaps some little fishing smack? And how were they going to find the shipmaster—how was it going to be worked at all? The third case was that of the psuedo-transmigrant—the man who came in pretending he was a transmigrant, but who did not leave this country for a foreign country. Now, why should the pseudo-transmigrant be sent abroad at the expense of the shipowner, rather than at the expense of the country? They were introducing new legislation on national grounds, because these aliens were said to do harm here—harm in regard to overcrowding and in regard to lowering the standard of life. Very well, on national grounds these men were to be kept out: but they were to be kept out at the cost of the shipowner! Well, that was not fair; it was not an English way of doing it.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he had no sympathy with the shipowners, and he thought, generally, that it was quite right to put the expense upon those who made the profit. But this particular clause was on an entirely different footing. If he understood the position rightly, the shipowners who would be affected were not those who made a profit by bringing these alien immigrants to this country, upon whom the charge could be properly placed, but those shipowners whose trade was a general trade in connection with which the bringing over of an occasional immigrant was only an incident. He did not think those shipowners should be put to the trouble of distinguishing between those who were ordinary passengers and those who might be immigrants. The shipowners whose business was carrying immigrants certainly ought to be compelled to carry out a proper supervision, but it was not fair, in his opinion, to lay the burden on the shipowner who only brought over one immigrant among thousands of other passengers. He certainly thought the Question put by his hon. friend the senior Member for Oldham required an Answer before a division was taken on the clause. He himself had listened to this debate with an open mind, and he had come to the conclusion, after hearing the speeches made, that if this charge was put on this particular class of shipowners a considerable injustice would be inflicted.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) said the course taken in regard to this sub-section was not calculated to encourage the Government in making concessions. His right hon. friend had put down an Amendment which, he ventured to think, he could satisfy the Committee removed every reasonable grievance that could be brought forward, yet the result was that the hon. Gentleman who had moved the omission of the sub-section seemed to be rather angry at what he considered his legitimate cause of complaint being taken away from him. It had been said that the sub-section as amended would not apply to those who were engaged in the regular business of bringing immigrants to this country. But it had been overlooked that, for the convenience of the shipowners, and very largely at their instance, they had allowed the immigrants to be conditionally disembarked for the purposes of examination. During that time the shipowner was responsible for them, and if during that time they were allowed to escape, was it unreasonable to say that the shipowner should be bound to take them back to the country from whence they came? If this sub-section were struck out, however, shipowners would be relieved of that liability. With regard to aliens who committed crimes in this country, or became chargeable to the Poor Law, it was eminently desirable that they should be expelled from the country; and nothing could be more reasonable than that the cost of taking away such people should be borne by those who brought them here. If the result of the provision were to make shipowners more cautious in bringing over undesirable aliens it would have attained its object.

MR. EMMOTT: Will the right hon. Gentleman reply with regard to the Calais and Dover traffic?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the provision would apply to the case of all aliens coming into the country, even though they did not come to an immigration port.

MR. EMMOTT: How are they to make the necessary inquiries as to character?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said if it was found impossible to find the shipowner who brought them that would entirely remove the hardship from the shipowner. As to character it was much more likely that something would be known at the port of embarkation than in this country.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said it would, perhaps, be difficult to award among the proposals of the Bill the prize for illogical sequence and practical futility, but he was disposed to think that in any such competition the present sub-section had a very good chance. It would be unfair in any circumstances to throw upon the shipowner the cost of the expulsion or the repatriation of the undesirable alien; but the sub-section created an absolutely absurd position. If the shipowner brought over a whole cargo of aliens who passed the immigration officer, and if all of them turned out to be undesirable in character within six months, he would not be subjected to the cost of their expulsion; if he brought them in batches of less than twenty, so that they would not have to go through the immigration office at all, and they turned out to be undesirable, he would have to pay the cost of repatriating them; and if they came as cabin passengers one by one with all the outward appearances of good character and social position, but with evil designs in their hearts, and within six months an expulsion order was made against them, he would have to pay the cost. It was impossible to conceive a greater Chinese puzzle than that.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) said that until he heard the speeches of the Home Secretary and the Attorney-General he thought that he understood this clause, but that was certainly not the case now. The right hon. Gentleman stated that it was necessary to have some control over the shipowner or shipmaster who might allow aliens to escape from custody. But under the Bill there was no power to issue an expulsion order against an alien on the ground that he had escaped from the custody of a shipowner.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said such a man would not be exempt from expulsion if he were found.

MR. LEIF JONES said it was not an offence under the Bill to escape from custody, and as the clause dealt solely with aliens against whom an expulsion order had been made he did not see that such a case as he suggested was covered by the clause at all.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the escape by itself would not render a man liable to expulsion, but it would not give him immunity for any crime he might have committed.

MR. LEIF JONES thought it would be much better to withdraw the section altogether, inasmuch as it would not deal with the particular case it was said to be intended to cover. The universal opinion of the Committee was that it would be unfair to throw this burden upon the shipowners in the interest of the nation.

MR. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale) believed the retention of the sub-section would have a deterrent effect in regard to the importation of undesirable aliens. Similar provisions to those here proposed were in operation and worked satisfactorily in nearly every other country in the world, and it was unnecessary to go further afield than the Channel Islands for an example of what this sub-section could do. The difficulty of the cross-Channel traffic would apply there as much as here, but it was there provided that the shipowner or owners who brought an alien to the islands should be held liable for the expense of his removal in the event of his becoming chargeable on any parish in the islands within a year and a day of his arrival. A similar liability was imposed with regard to cost of maintenance within a certain period. Those provisions had been in full operation for years; the authorities had experienced no difficulty in carrying them out, and they had certainly proved very effectual in restricting the admission of undesirable aliens. Seeing that such provisions were in successful operation so near to our own shores, he failed to see how any case could be made out against their enactment here.

Mr. HARWOOD (Bolton) said the genesis of this apparently absurd clause was really very simple. No provision existed for the detention of these aliens pending examination, and in order to avoid having to make that provision this most absurd clause had been inserted. The common sense of the question was that if these people were to be kept for examination the authorities should provide the security for their detention. It was their business to do so, and not the business of the shipowner. As to the liability of shipowners for passengers they had brought over, no record of the passengers was kept, and it would be impossible to prove by what particular line a man had come over. The section was really absurd.

Mr. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) said the difficulties in connection with this matter had not been in the least exaggerated, especially in regard to cross-Channel trade. The Home Secretary seemed to have forgotten that there were lines of steamers belonging to foreign Governments concerned in that trade. If undesirable aliens were brought over in the ships of the Belgian State Line, would the penalties be imposed on the captain of the steamer? Similarly, were the North of France Railway Company to be called upon to keep a record of all the people they carried on their steamers between Calais and Dover? Then in the case of the steamers of the South-Eastern Railway Company, were the captains, instead of remaining on the bridge, to go ferreting about inquiring into the character and antecedents of their passengers? The more the clause was examined the more ludicrous and impracticable it became, and it was impossible to see how it could be enforced.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that this sub-section was a confession of the futility and ineffectual character of every section of the Bill. What was to happen in the case of a man who within a certain time of his arrival was found to have committed a felony? Although the man had been specially examined, passed as morally, physically, and financially sound, and therefore had given security such as was not required for an ordinary inhabitant, yet the shipowner who brought him over was to be called upon at his own charge to take him back whence he came. If the Amendment of the Attorney-General was to be passed what was the use of all this. It was admitted that these aliens would still be able to dribble in after this Bill was passed without any control whatever, and they could not prevent such infiltration of undesirable aliens as had been suggested. This sub-section, even with the Amendment of the Attorney-General, was a confession that the whole arrangement was ineffectual, because what were put forward as securities in the Bill were not securities at all.

Mr. CHURCHILL said the speech of the hon. Member opposite illustrated one of the disadvantages under which they were forced to conduct this debate. The Government did not intend to make the smallest concession to arguments in that House. All the Government had to do was to sit still and wait until he guillotine fell. Nobody could deny that they were now being asked to make the Imperial Parliament responsible for an absurdity. This provision, as amended, was unworkable. The right hon. Gentleman had made a concession, and yet he had preserved all the restrictions against the shipowners. The right hon. Gentleman said that this Bill could not be applied to cabin passengers, and yet what was considered too complicated for the Government was now being imposed upon the shipowners to carry out. It was a very wrong thing to impose liabilities upon shipowners in respect of matters which were entirely beyond their control and to impose upon law-abiding citizens duties which they knew they could not perform. He had listened to the Attorney-General with a good deal of sympathy. They knew he possessed a most marvellous brain and talents, but, owing to the exigencies of the political situation, the right hon. and learned Gentleman had to devote his great abilities to defending propositions which he knew were arrant nonsense, and which he knew were indefensible in theory and unworkable in practice. It was no use their arguing the question further because the Government majority was at hand. It might not matter much to those opposed to the Government how ridiculous they made themselves by their legislation, but when legislation which was plainly unworkable was brought forward the whole fabric of the law was brought under suspicion and contempt.

SIR **ROBERT FINLAY** read, in reply to the criticisms which had been made, the 11th Section of the United States Act of 1891, which provided that any alien coming in in violation of the law might be returned as by law provided within one year after his arrival at the expense of the company or vessel which brought him, and if that could not be done, then he was to be returned at the expense of the United States. They could also return any alien who had become a public charge within a year from certain causes laid down in the Act. In the other case alluded to, the alien could be proceeded against as a rogue and a vagabond.

*SIR **CHARLES DILKE** (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the Attorney-General seemed to think that he had answered their case by quoting the law of the United States, but that had no bearing whatever upon this question. The practical difficulties were those which concerned the cross-Channel traffic. The great difficulty was the state of things described by the hon. Member for Louth, for in the cross-Channel traffic there could not be any attempt made to identify any person, and it would be impossible to apply such a system to that traffic. The French Government had long since given up attempting to provide for the supervision of the traffic across the Lake of Geneva from Switzerland even in time of war.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 221; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 264.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Ferderick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B.. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Rt Hn Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs.
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.

Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Gordon, Maj.Evans-(T'rH'mlet
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnEldon
Goschen Hon.George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare,Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heath, Sir James(StaffordsNW
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hon.James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hon.Col.W
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Henage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol.S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis(Edinburgh)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir FrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morrell, Geogre Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, SirHarryS.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marleybone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,Rt Hn J Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffi'd
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton-und.Lyne
Whitmore,Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R, (Dorset
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H.(Yorks)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Younger, William.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon, James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,N.E.(York,NR,Whitby
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, CharlesRamsey(Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Fenwick, Charles

Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N. E.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. Morley
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macveagh, Jeremiah
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor James (Wicklow, W)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan, V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Thomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Catchart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Hudddersf'
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Emmott, and Mr. Winston Churchill.

Amendment proposed—

"'In page 3, line 39, after the word 'alien,' to insert the words 'not being an alien who last entered the United Kingdom before the commencement of the Act, or an immigrant in whose case leave to land has been given under this Act." '—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) moved an Amendment for the purpose of extending from six months to one year the liability of the shipmasters for expenses under Sub-section 2 of Clause 4 in respect of an alien against whom an expulsion order was made. He considered that the period of six months was far too short. When an alien came to this country it would be very unlikely that he would at once prove himself to be undesirable. An alien might come here with enough means to support himself for a time and subsequently become a charge on the rates. Surely six months would be a very short time for a case to be proved against him sufficiently for an expulsion order to be made. They must remember also that Government Departments were slow, and that inquiries would necessarily take time.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 40, to leave out the words 'six months,' and insert the words 'one year.'"—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'six months' stand part of the clause."

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he fully sympathised with the desire expressed by the hon. Gentleman that they should take every safeguard they possibly could, not to prevent the undesirable alien from being expelled. Those who had listened to the debate that afternoon would see that there were a great many restrictions put on the shipowner and shipmaster. He thought they could not continue the liability under this sub-section for more than six months. He did not think there was any substance in his hon. friend's objection that the process of administration under this Act would be so slow and cumbrous as to justify the alteration in the sub-section which he proposed.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) moved the omission of the words in Sub-section 2 of Clause 4 making shipmasters liable to pay to the Secretary of State as a debt due to the Crown any sums paid by the Secretary of State under the section in connection with aliens who were brought to this country in their ships, and who were returned under expulsion orders. He and his friends contended that the expenses incurred for the punishment of an alien should not be defrayed by the owner or master of the ship in which the alien came to this country. That expense should be an ordinary charge for the administration of justice in this country.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 3, to leave out from the word 'shall,' to the end of line 5."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said the obligation was laid on the shipowner to find a passage for an expelled alien. He did not see that the Government could accept the Amendment if for no other reason than that by so doing they would stultify themselves in regard to the action taken during the past two hours with respect to the liability of shipowners.

Mr. EMMOTT asked whether a Belgian shipmaster who had brought an Austrian to this country could be asked to pay under this section if an expulsion order was granted against that alien on account of his having been adjudged guilty of an offence.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES asked what would be done to get payment if the shipowner or shipmaster was a foreigner. Would they put an embargo on his ship?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said that Sub-section 2 of Clause 7 incorporated in this Act certain portions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, with reference to the enforcement of payment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 223; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 265.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arroll, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt.Hn.Gerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M.M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H F (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson(King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Percy Captain A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry

Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. F. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir WilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,RtHnAilwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R.B.(Inv'rn'ssBghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S,W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir AugustusFrederick
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath,Sir James(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J.(Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hon,Col.W
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(MileEnd)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver,SirLewis (EdinburghW
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir FrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Myers, William Henry
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, SirHarryS.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marleybone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, HC.(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, Rt HnJ.Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley,Rt.Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col. SirC EH(Sheffield
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby,Sir CharlesG.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wyndham, Rt. Hon, George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, NE.(York,NR.Whitby
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar

Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, CharlesRamsay(Galwa
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans, SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay,Alexander(Lanark,NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B
Hammond, John
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. CharlesFredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones William, (Carnarvonsh.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M,Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Kean, John
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway,N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parrott, William
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Samuel Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson(Leeds,S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay, T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse, Sir JT(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Runciman and Mr. Emmott.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 234 ; Noes, 175. (Division List No. 266.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. AllenBenjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles,Lt.-Col.H.F.(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James

Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Charles (Poplar
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Rt Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'n'ss B'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, Maj Evans (Tr'H'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Heath, Sir James (Staffords. NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Rt Hn J. Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,N.E(York,NR,Whitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig,RobertHunter(Lanark)
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,Capt.E.C.(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay,Alexander(Lanark,NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,VincentP. (Cavan,W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex.(Donegal,W.)
Lawson,SirWilfrid(Cornwall)
Layland.Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Laren,SirCharlesBenjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan,Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor,James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare,N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond,JohnE.(Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas,Abel(Carmarthen,E)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson,CharlesHenry (Hull,W.
Wilson,Fred.W. (Norfolk,Mid.)
Wilson,Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T(Hudd'rsfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Corrie Grant and Mr. Keir Hardie.

And, it being half-past Six of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of July 5th, successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the business allotted to the Sitting.

Clause 5 :—

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 245; Noes, 181. (Division List No. 267.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHn. GeraldW. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn. J. A. (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, SirFred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Rt. Hn. Ailwyn Edw.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r.
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R B (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J E (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, Maj. Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon Ronald
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir James (Staffords, N W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lee, ArthurH (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Thorgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hn. James

Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,SirHarry S.(Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, Rt.HnJParker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J.M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent,Col. Sir C.E H(Sheffi'ld
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.CE (Taunton)
Welby,Sir Charles G.E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H. (Yorks.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,N.E.(York,NR,Whitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptEC (S.Andrw'sB'ghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Field, William
Findlay,Alexander(Lanark,NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B
Hammond, John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Humphreys-Owen Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,VincentP.(Cavan,W.)
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary,N.)
O'Connor,James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James

Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull, W
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Fenwick and Mr. Keir Hardie.

Clause 6:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 7, after the word 'department,' to insert the words 'or any port sanitary authority.'" (*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 9, after the word 'department,' to insert the words 'or authority.'" (*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 250; Noes, 191. (Division List No. 268.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulsfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col H F (Middlesex)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropshire
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn J A (Glasgow)
Carson, Rt Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Rt. Hn. Ailywn Edw.
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'ry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir James (Staffords. NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J F (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.

Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn. H. L.W.(Mile End
Lee, ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.- Col. A. R.
Long, Col Chas. W.(Evesham
Long,RtHn.Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Fredk. G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon.J.Scott(Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, DavidJ.(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reed, Sir Edw. James(Cardiff)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie,Rt.Hon.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis Romford
Smith,HC (North mb.Tyneside
Smith, RtHn JParker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon.W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley,Rt Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHon.JG.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent,Col Sir CEH.(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.AC.E.(Taunton)
Welby, Sir Charles GE.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,N.E.(York,NR,Whitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt EC(SAndrewsB'ghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidst'ne
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert J.
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel

Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Lief (Appleby)
Jones, William Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Williams
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C R Northants.)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull, W
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W (Worcestershire, N
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Hudd'rsf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Bright and Mr. Ainsworth.

Clause 7:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 32, to leave out the word 'landed' and insert the word 'disembark.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) said that, on a point of order, he desired to point out that whereas the Chairman asked hon. Members on the Opposition Benches to proceed to the lobby on the previous division, Members on the Ministerial Benches were there at that division for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not exactly a point of order; but I hope hon. Members will proceed to the division lobbies for the general convenience of the Committee.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 248; Noes, 186. (Division List No. 269.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir Wm Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt Hn. A J (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boustfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt-Col H F (Middlesex)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropshr.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George

Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc.)
Chamberlayne, T. S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edw. Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Doulas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Rt Hn Ailwyn Edw.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r.
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Phillip S (Warwick, S W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh

Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Heath, Sir Jas. (Staffords. N W
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn. H L. W. (Mile End)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt Hn Sir Frederick G
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. W. R. Wellesley
Percy, Earl

Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Rt Hn. J Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,NE(York,NR,Whitby)
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas.Ramsay (Galway)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(S.Andr'wsB'ghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay,Alexander(Lanark,NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Grant, Corrie
Grey,Rt.Hon.SirE.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan,W
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway,N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt.Hn.CR.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk, Mid)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. Herb. Samuel.

Clause 8:—

MR. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury) said the Amendment he now moved was to leave out of Clause 8, at line 15, the word "steerage." He would have been glad to see the Government base this Bill mainly on the principle of Clause 3, but if there was to be this examination, and the Committee had agreed that there was to be, then he submitted it was not desirable to confine it only to steerage passengers. It was alien to our laws and the best traditions of this country that persons should be refused a landing on these shores simply because they were poor. Further than that, it was quite obvious that employers of foreign labour and other importers of aliens could quite easily avoid the provisions of this Bill as it at present stood by giving undesirable aliens a second-class ticket, and thus making them cabin passengers. Undesirable aliens who came into this country were by no means confined to steerage passengers, and if this Bill was to be operative it was essential that this Amendment should be accepted so that an examination should be made of all aliens at the port of immigration. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 15, to leave out the word 'steerage.' "—(*Mr. Fuller.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'steerage' stand part of the clause."

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said that if the Amendment were adopted it would have the effect of remodelling the Bill. The principle on which the Bill was drawn was that they were to provide for the inspection of those who invariably came as steerage passengers. If they were to provide for the inspection of all immigrants, whether cabin or steerage, they would have to have a most elaborate system of examination at all their ports. There would have, for instance, to be an immigration board at Dover.

Mr. FULLER said that Dover was not an immigration port.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said that was true, but the scheme of this Amendment was that all people coming into this country must be examined, and Dover, under those circumstances, might at once become an immigration port. There were only two possible ways of dealing with this matter; one, the way in which the Bill as drawn proposed to deal with it, by examining all who came in at specified ports, and the other to examine all persons who came into this country.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) expressed his regret that the hon. and learned Gentleman had refused to accept this Amendment in so curt a manner. He said that it was perfectly obvious that those who had 2s. to spare for their passage across the Channel could convert themselves into cabin passengers and thus evade the law, and it would be the class of alien that came into the country in that way which would be the most undesirable. It would be the prostitute, the person who lived on prostitution, and the expert criminal who would pay this extra money, and so gain admission into the country without examination. The Government deliberately refused an Amendment which would enable them to catch these people as they came in instead of having to resort to the elaborate and difficult process of catching them and turning them out after they had come in. He was sorry this line had been taken by the Government, more especially having regard to the fact that it was to be left to the Home Secretary to define what a steerage passenger was. He thought that that definition ought to be given now, as that was really the pivot on which the Bill turned.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said the common sense of the people of these islands had long decided the principle of sumptuary laws, and this was a sumptuary law pure and simple. The persons who would be able to come into this country were the forgers, the bankrupts, the expert criminals, and all those classes of undesirables who invariably travelled first class. They were not excluded by this Bill, which only penalised the industrious immigrant whose poverty compelled him to travel steerage. He thought the demand of his hon. friend the Member for Halifax for a definition of a steerage passenger was a reasonable one, there being on most boats three classes of passengers.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

ALIENS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 6, line 15, to leave out the word 'steerage.'"—(*Mr. Fuller.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'steerage' stand part of the clause."

MR. FLYNN said that as there were other important Amendments which they were desirous of discussing he would not occupy the attention of the Committee further on this Amendment.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.) said his right hon. friend seemed to think that "steerage passenger" was a term which could be easily defined by anybody; that it was a colloquical expression well known to the law, and that the mere introduction of it into an Act of Parliament was quite sufficient to define a particular class of passengers. The term "steerage passenger" had never been defined for reasons which would at once be seen by the Committee when they remembered the different classes of boats in use and the different regulations under which they carried passengers, regulations so varied that what might be called a cabin passenger on one line might be a steerage passenger on another. The definition of a "steerage passenger" in the Merchant Shipping Act did not help them, because that definition only applied to long voyages and not to the short journeys taken by these aliens. For instance, a steerage passenger, according to the Merchant Shipping Act, had to have thirty-six superficial feet of space allotted to him. These aliens considered themselves well off when they had six feet alloted to them. Then a steerage passenger, according to the Merchant Shipping Act, had to be messed at the same table with the master or the first officer of the ship. That again must certainly apply to long voyages, because on these short voyages there was no messing at all. It was therefore perfectly clear that for the purposes of this Bill the definition of "steerage passenger" could not be taken from the Merchant Shipping Act, and it was therefore essential that the words "steerage passenger" should be defined in this Act.

If the definition of a steerage passenger was that assumed by the senior Member for Oldham as a person who paid a steerage fare, and who could not afford to pay for a cabin passage, then he would agree that this Bill failed. He would agree that if the mere fact of paying a few extra shillings took these persons out of the category of steerage passengers, this Bill was not a sufficient protection to the people of these islands who wished to be protected from these aliens. There was, therefore, a more direct reference as to what should be a steerage passenger in this Bill. There was a discretion in the Secretary of State for home affairs, and it was quite right and quite proper that there should be that discretion; and that the Home Secretary should be able to say what persons should be, and what persons should not be, considered cabin passengers, the object being to define steerage passengers. The object of this Amendment really was to make this inspection absolutely universal, and to ensure that every foreigner should be examined, whether they came into this country as steerage passengers or first-class passengers. That was not a thing to which he and those who thought with him agreed, for the simple reasons that first of all, in their opinion, it was wholly unnecessary, and, secondly, it would, as they contended, restrict our intercourse with the Continent.

SIR GEORGE BARTLEY said he should like to say just two words to show the difference between the way in which aliens were treated in this Bill and the treatment meted out to them in America. He recently crossed from Canada into the United States, and while he was on the car as they crossed the border, an official came into the car, and said "Sir you are an alien," to which he replied, "I daresay I am." The official then took his name and address, and that of his wife and his servants, and, in fact, made a list of the whole party, after which he turned round and said, "Sir, you do not seem to resent being called an alien," to which he, Sir George, replied, "No, I should resent it if I were not here." Such an experience showed that they did take a list in America, and, therefore, it did not seem to him to be unreasonable that there should be a limitation in this Bill. It showed that we were rather behind other countries in this matter. It seemed to him that the provision they were now discussing was of great importance to this country, and he could not see why there should be all this objection to seeing that those who came to this country should be persons of good character.

*MR. FORDE RIDLEY (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said that they had listened to some remarkable speeches since the dinner hour, and for once he regretted to say he found himself differing from his hon. friend the Member for Hackney. It seemed to him that they were not debating the question before the House. They were debating the definition of a word which was different altogether to that to which the Amendment on the Paper referred. The word to which the Amendment referred was not "steerage" but "immigrant." The Bill said that the immigrant under this Act should mean a steerage passenger. It was not the definition of a steerage passenger which was required, that was already defined by the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894, but for the purposes of this Bill they had to make a new definition because they were dealing with an entirely new expression. That was to say, they had to deal with the word "immigrant" in law. They had to define what they meant by "immigrant," and he found himself entirely in accord with the hon. Member for Wiltshire and his hon. friend who also had an Amendment to the same effect upon the Paper. It was a very great pity that they had to insert the word "steerage" at all.

It had already been pointed out on former occasions that if this Bill was to be workable in an economic sense it must not put this country to a huge and unnecessary expenditure—to a higher expenditure than was necessary, and, therefore, the idea was to confine the operations of the Act to those particular ports at which the immigrants arrived in bulk. They knew that at present there were only eight or nine ports at which immigrants arrived in this country, and if they were going to leave out the word "steerage" and were going to examine every immigrant who came to this country they would have to go to very much greater expense and set up an immigration board at every port at which an alien might arrive. He believed that when in operation the Act would not be expensive and that the burden upon the taxpayers would not be nearly so great as many hon. Members anticipated. But if the word "steerage" was removed from the clause it would be at once necessary to set up machinery at every port at which immigrants arrived, and to examine cabin passengers as well as steerage passengers, with the result that instead of the Act throwing only a very moderate tax upon the community the expense would be much greater than it need or was expected to be. Considerable time had been spent in advocating a "pious opinion" which really would not work unless the country were prepared to pay a price which was altogether unnecessary and would not in any way help in the exclusion of undesirable aliens from our shores. He was sure that all would agree in leaving out the word "steerage" if it were possible, but seeing that the immigrant trade was restricted to a very limited number of ports, and that it was undesirable to put the country to unnecessary expense, he submitted that it was essential that the word should remain in the clause. He hoped, therefore, that the Home Secretary would not accept the Amendment.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln) suggested that it would be much better to take the ordinary definition of "immigrant" as given in the dictionary—viz., an alien who came for the purpose of permanent residence in a country. That would avoid all the objections which had been urged against the proposal in the Bill. The term "steerage passenger" was understood to mean a poor man, and grave objection was taken to applying a series of regulations with reference to being guilty of crimes and so forth to poor men and not to rich. He hoped the Home Secretary would carefully consider that point.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS pointed out that it was very difficult to know how many aliens came here to reside and how many were simply transmigrants, and he was afraid he must adhere to the definition in the Bill. He thought they were more likely by that means to keep out the really undesirable. Then it had been urged that the effect of the Bill would be to keep out poor men, while rich men would be able to come in even though they were undesirable. It was impossible to prevent the infiltration of aliens at every port in the country, but as 97 per cent. of the aliens who entered the country came in at eight or ten ports the Government thought they should set up an efficient barrier at those ports and not inflict upon every passenger who might arrive the annoyance or hindrance of an examination. It was perfectly true that undesirable aliens of the richer class might get through. The Government had never supposed that they could keep them out by the first part of the Bill, but they believed that they could keep out a very large influx of aliens who were likely to prove a detriment to the country, while high-class criminals could be efficiently dealt with under another clause in the Bill. Such persons could not be dealt with under the earlier portion of the Bill without an examination of every passenger, and it did not at all follow that they would be detected even then; therefore it was not thought desirable to inflict so great a hardship upon all passengers for a problematical benefit.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 144; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 270.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt.Hn GeraldW(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bousfield, William Robert
Brymer, William Ernest
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.JA(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clave, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane Hon. Thomas H. A.E
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir J. C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Fellowes, Rt.Hn.AilwynEdwd.
Fergusson, Rt.Hn. SirJ.(Man'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, SirRB(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon,Hn..J.E(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. Evans(T'rH'ml'ts
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Hamilton, Marq. of(L'nd'nd'ry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt.Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbt. Merton
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn. Col.W.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,Frederick,N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt.Hn. Walter(Bristol,S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert W.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.

Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H. C (North'mbTyneside
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N. E. (YorkN. R Whitby
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Grant, Corrie
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Kean, John
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Rose, Charles Day
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C(Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson(Leeds, S
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merion'th)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Fuller and Mr. J. H. Whitley.

MR. MARKS (Kent, Thanet) moved to insert words so that the definition should read, "The expression 'immigrant' . . . means an alien steerage passenger or alien member of the crew . . . " his object being to prevent a certain class of undesirables from evading the provisions of the Act by working their passage across as seamen. That the point was of some importance was shown by the fact that from 26 to 28 per cent. of the men engaged each year on British merchant ships were foreigners, and the percentage was steadily increasing. The evil existed particularly in connection with cattle boats from the Argentine and other parts of the world, and unless some such provision as he proposed were inserted a most undesirable class of immigrants would find their way into this country without being subjected to the safeguards imposed with regard to other classes.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 15, after the word 'passenger' to insert the words 'or alien member of the crew.'"—(*Mr. Marks.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MAJOR EVANS GORDON said that evidence was given before the Royal Commission to show that the worst and most undesirable class of aliens were precisely those referred to in this Amendment, who, at nominal wages, worked their passage across, without having the slightest pretence to being seamen. The class of people who had been alluded to were generally people of a very bad character, who could find their way to this country only in this way. He thought some attempt should be made to stop these people coming here and landing, and mixing with the general population.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) pointed out to the Home Secretary that since nine o'clock seven speakers had addressed the House from the Ministerial side. This showed that the matter was an important matter, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to advise the Prime Minister to take into consideration the desirability of granting an additional day for the discussion of the Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order. That question is not relevant to this Amendment.

* MR. FORDE RIDLEY said he had had practical experience, and testimony from gentleman of undoubted integrity connected with the shipping community, as to the truth of the state of things which the hon. and gallant Member for Stepney had just described. It was a fact that some of the most abandoned characters—he could find no other more suitable expression to describe these cattlemen—were shipped over from South America in this way under the name of seamen, and in this way some of the most disgraceful characters arrived in this country. That being the case, he hoped the Government would insert some words to protect this country and those who dwelt in it from the danger of having an influx of such people as certainly were extremely detrimental to any nation where they were permitted to land. He felt very strongly upon this question, and no exaggerated terms had been used by the hon. and gallant Member for Stepney in regard to these cattlemen. He hoped some steps would be taken in this Bill to prevent such immigration, whether they came in large or small numbers, and he trusted that the Home Secretary would insert words to meet this case.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said there was no doubt that this Amendment was directed towards meeting a real grievance, because many of these cattlemen were most undesirable persons. In the past they had been allowed to land here, and the object of this Amendment was to give power to deal with such cases. He hoped, however, that his hon. friend would not press this Amendment to a division, because the Government had been advised of this evil, and they had endeavoured to meet it so far as cattlemen were concerned. If the hon. Member would look at the 3rd Sub-section of this clause he would see that the expression "passenger" included "any person carried on the ship other than the master and persons employed in the working or service of the ship." These cattlemen might be nominally engaged as members of the crew, but they were not employed in the working or service of the ship. The Government were fully alive to this evil, but they believed that the words he had alluded to were effective for the purpose of excluding this most undesirable class of persons. He, therefore, hoped his hon. friend would not press this Amendment to a division, as the words contained in the Amendment raised a very large question which was really foreign to the purpose of this Bill. They were all aware that a great many British vessels were manned to a great extent by foreigners, and to prevent all these foreigners landing as proposed by this Amendment would be taking a step of a most alarming character. He sympathised with the object of the mover and seconder of this Amendment, but it was not desirable to press it in the form in which it had been put down.

Mr. MARKS: Under these circumstances, I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. FULLER moved to insert after "passenger" the words "not born in the United Kingdom," and asked the Attorney-General whether a person born in the United Kingdom could be an alien. If not, he would not insist on his Amendment.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said at common law a person born in the United Kingdom could not get rid of his allegiance; but by the Naturalisation Act of 1870 it had been provided that if a British subject became naturalised in a foreign State he ceased to be a British subject. Therefore, a person born in the United Kingdom might become an alien.

Mr. FULLER: Do I understand that British subjects are excluded from the operation of the Bill?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: Certainly; so long as they remain British subjects.

Mr. FULLER said that his Amendment concerned an Englishman or a Scotchman who, having been in the United States for a period of years, wished to pay a temporary visit to his friends in this country. He asked the Attorney-General whether words could not be inserted which would make it impossible for anyone born in the United Kingdom to be excluded therefrom.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 15, after the word 'passenger,' to insert the words 'not born in the United Kingdom.'"—(*Mr. Fuller.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. WHITLEY said that as he had an Amendment on the Paper in the same words, perhaps he would be permitted to say one or two words. At an earlier stage of the Bill they succeeded in obtaining a promise from the Attorney-General that he would endeavour to meet the difficulty which had been raised, but the Amendment put forward by the Government to meet this case came under the guillotine, and this was the only opportunity left to them for the discussion of this point. As the Bill stood an Englishman, born and bred in this country, who had been naturalised in the United States and desired to spend the rest of his days in the old country, might be treated as a rogue and a vagabond if he travelled third class on an immigrant ship and tried to land at any other than one of the eight or ten ports mentioned in the Bill. The only way in which the case of such a man could be met was by specially excepting him from the definition of "alien immigrant."

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he did not quite understand who the people were whom the Amendment was intended to exempt. In the ordinary course of things every person born in the United Kingdom was necessarily a British subject. The Government had put down an Amendment to meet the case of the man whom they supposed the hon. Member for Cork had in view—namely, the man born in this country who emigrated to a foreign country, became naturalised, and revisited the United Kingdom, intending to make only a short stay here. But surely it would not be contended that such a man, who for some purpose good to himself sacrificed his British nationality, should be allowed to return without at least undergoing some process of examination, with, for instance, a view to seeing that he was not a lunatic? The Government had put down words which, in his opinion, would meet the case complained of in regard to Ireland.

Mr. WHITLEY: I raised the question long before hon. Members from Ireland brought it forward with reference to workmen from Lancashire and Yorkshire.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he did not think that a man who had chosen to sacrifice his own nationality should be allowed to come to this country without any examination or without their putting into operation with regard to him the safeguards which were laid down in the Bill. He was sorry that the Amendment he put down came under the closure, and he regretted that it did not go far enough to meet what hon. Members opposite desired, but he was not prepared to make a general extension in regard to this case.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) thought the Amendment was a most reasonable one. The Home Secretary seemed to think that it was a sort of crime for a British workman who emigrated to a foreign country to naturalise himself there. It was rather hard on such a man, who desired to fulfil the duties of citizenship in the country in which he had settled down, to be told that he had done an unpatriotic thing, and therefore was to be subjected to an examination as if he were a rogue and a vagabond on revisiting his old home. Surely the Home Secretary must have forgotten altogether the indignities which this Bill proposed to inflict. The contention of his hon. friend was that a British-born subject who became naturalised in the country where he had emigrated to should be exempted from all these obligations under this Bill when he returned to this country. He might be required to prove his British birth, but that ought to be enough. This point affected not only British-born subjects in this country, but also those who were born in the Colonies.

MR. DAVID MACIVER contended that the Amendment was both unreasonable and unworkable. He remembered a case where sixteen lunatics were sent back to this country by the United States Government. He did not think it was right that men who had spent the best years of their lives in the United States should be sent back to this country when they had become chargeable to the States. That was an illustration of the danger which would arise if the United States were free to send back to this country everybody who, though naturalised there, had become chargeable on the rates. He did not think that would be right and fair. The words suggested by the Attorney-General were quite sufficient.

MR. FLYNN said some interesting points had been raised in this debate. This country went to war some time ago in South Africa, and one of the objects of that war was to enable people who went there to naturalise earlier than the Transvaal laws allowed. Was not one of the grievances against the Transvaal Government that they would not make the period shorter? This Bill as it now stood would exclude a large number of Irish-born citizens who had been naturalised in the United States and who wished to return for a short time to visit thei rrelatives in Ireland, unless they came as cabin passengers. It ought not to be beyond the powers of the Attorney-General and the Attorney-General for Ireland to devise some form of words which would meet their case. He acknowledged the courtesy of the Home Secretary and the Attorney-General in endeavouring to meet the case which the Irish Members brought forward last week. He admitted that there was considerable difficulty in framing such a definition as would meet the case with which they were dealing. But surely it did not surpass the combined intelligence of these Gentlemen to devise some form of words which would meet the case. The Home Secretary's Amendment was passed last night after the closure rule came into operation, and hon. Members from Ireland had no opportunity of discussing its terms. They were placed in the position of having *nolens volens* to accept the Amendment. The bulk of the Irishmen who went to America became naturalised there. Surely the right hon. Gentleman was not unaware of the appalling emigration which went on from Ireland owing, as the Irish representatives said, to bad government. A small number of them made money, and when they returned to visit their homes and friends they came as cabin passengers. A large proportion who returned to visit friends did not travel as saloon passengers, and, under this Bill as it stood, it was possible that their admission to their native land might be objected to. That was a monstrous state of things. That never was intended by the framers of the Bill. It never entered their imagination that in attempting to deal with the question of alien labour in the East End of London they were framing a measure which would have the effect of preventing Irishmen who had emigrated to America from revisiting their native land. He challenged contradiction on that point. The case was unanswerable. The Government had no right to put any artificial barrier in the way of Irishmen who wished to return from the United States to visit their native land. Irishmen were entitled by all laws, human and divine, to do that without let or hindrance from the British Government. He and his friends would protest against that so long as they could do so. He said it was nothing short of tyranny that, because it was desired to exclude a certain class of foreigners, Irishmen should be dubbed aliens and prevented from returning to the land of their birth.

Mr. ABEL THOMAS (Carmarthen, E.) said the Bill hit Welshmen as well as Irishmen. He knew many cases of steel workers and coal workers who, when times were bad in Glamorganshire and Monmouthshire, went to the United States, stayed there for five or six years, and when times were good again here returned to their native land. To dub such people as aliens and vagabonds was monstrous, and he was surprised at any Government bringing such an absurd Bill into the House. It might be that in some districts aliens had done harm, but he believed the grievance had been exaggerated.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Gentleman is getting a long way from the Amendment.

Mr. ABEL THOMAS said that what was material was that Welshmen who had left this country under the circumstances he had indicated would be precluded by this Bill from coming back when times became bad in America, because, having been naturalised there, they would come back as aliens.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said he was sure the Committee were sensible of the temperate way in which the hon. Member for North Cork had brought this matter before them. The hon. Member had admitted that he himself had failed to devise any form of words which would be satisfactory. The hon. Member had thrown upon him the task of achieving what he, with the assistance of his friends from Ireland, had been unable to do.

Mr. FLYNN said he gave notice of an Amendment containing the form of words which he desired to introduce, but as the closure came into operation he could not move it.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said no form of words had been devised which would satisfy those interested in this subject. The hon. Member need not be discouraged at his failure, because the task was an impossible one. He hoped to satisfy not only the hon. Member for North Cork, but also the hon. Member for East Carmarthen, that it was impossible to introduce a general Amendment without achieving a result which both of them would warmly repudiate. A suggestion had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen as to the indignity inflicted on immigrants under this Bill if they came in this way. He respectfully suggested that that was rather a strong word to use. Nobody thought an indignity was inflicted upon immigrants into the United States from this country because the authorities of that country thought it right to put in force the laws against the immigration of undesirable aliens.

Mr. BRYCE said the laws were not put in force against passengers in the way it was proposed to do here.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY begged the right hon. Gentleman's pardon But that was not the only part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech to which he took exception. He would call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Amendment opened up a very wide question. If they were to exempt persons born in the United Kingdom what were they going to do with persons born in Canada? If they were to accept an Amendment of this kind they must apply it to all persons born in any part of His Majesty's dominions. [An Hon. Member Why not?] The Amendment, therefore, was altogether unsatisfactory. He could not understand how the right hon. Gentleman could say that the Home Secretary had spoken of its being a crime for a British subject, after settling in America, to become naturalised. His right hon. friend said nothing of the kind. It was a natural thing for any man to do; there was no stigma or taint of criminality about it. But it was another question whether the country of this man's adoption should shunt its failures on the country of origin.

MR. BRYCE said the United States had no right to deport its citizens.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he was speaking of those who had become naturalised in America. They should not come here and throw themselves on the rates of this country.

MR. BRYCE said that was not the Irish case.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said it was a consequence in which the Amendment would land the people of this country. It was the right of this country to say that those who had become naturalised in America should remain there and should not come home to throw themselves upon the poor rates here. A man might have been guilty of a crime in America which was the subject of extradition. He was to be exempted from the operation of the Bill, and there was no power in the case of a person who had elected to become an alien and who in the country of his adoption had been guilty of a crime to prevent him from returning to this country.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): The extradition law will operate.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said if the crime was one which was subject to extradition an alien might be prevented from landing in this country. The Amendment proposed to exempt him altogether. Was that a reasonable proposal? It was impossible for the Government to accept the Amendment. He had been touched by the eloquence of the hon. Member for Cork when he drew a picture of the Irishmen returning from America to visit their friends. He had tried to find words to meet the case submitted by the hon. Member without prejudice to the general principle of the Bill, and the result was the Amendment now incorporated as part of the first clause.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) said the Attorney-General had not attempted to answer the Question which was put to him by his hon. friend the Member for East Carmarthen in regard to Welsh working men who were anxious to return to this country and to earn an honest living at their trades. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to postpone the consideration of this part of the Bill until he saw his way clear to defend the honest worker. They had heard a great deal about Imperialism and of Canada, but what became of Imperialism if they could not defend a worker who desired to return to this country?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) pointed out that during the last fifty years millions of the Irish people had gone to America, and the great majority had become naturalised there. There was an enormous traffic between America and Ireland during the summer season, thousands coming as steerage passengers to visit their native country. There was also another class of Irishman who came back to Ireland to stay, not to go upon the rates but to die in the country of his birth. The Government hardly seemed able to understand the attachment the Irishman felt for his old home. Those people should be considered in debating the Bill, and for that reason he supported the Amendment. It was all very well to talk about criminals and lunatics. No one wished to have the criminals. He and others would give the Government power to deal with them, but he appealed to the Government to acknowledge the claims of the class he had mentioned. The Bill seemed to have been drawn without the slightest regard to the consideration of this class, and with a desire simply to exclude aliens from the East End of London.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said he thought that the remedy for the complaint which had been made by the hon.

Gentleman opposite was already in the Bill in an Amendment which was accepted by the Government and passed the previous night under the guillotine. Obviously it was to the joint interest of the great steamship companies, who brought these passengers, and of the passengers themselves, that there should be a landing, if possible, without the indignity of an examination at all; and the Amendment put forward by the steamship companies, and accepted by the Government the previous night, was to the effect that the Secretary of State might, by order, exempt any ships where security was given to his satisfaction that undesirable immigrants would not be landed in the United Kingdom from those immigrant ships except for the purpose of transit. It appeared to him that in that Amendment there lay the means of getting round a very serious difficulty referred to by the hon. Gentleman.

*MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.) said he wished to put a purely legal point in a spirit of very respectful inquiry. He believed it was the case that anyone born of British parents in a foreign country could claim to be regarded as a British subject. Under these circumstances could he come to this country free under this Bill? It seemed to him to be an absurdity, if that were the case, that anyone born in Great Britain, and who went to the United States, would not be allowed to return to this country without examination and inquiry, whereas a person born in the United States would be allowed to do so.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he did not think this provision would apply to those who were born and remained British subjects. It was impossible to find an Amendment which would meet all requirements.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said that by the common law of England no British subject could divest himself of his British citizenship. That was the principle which led to the war of 1812, and to the severe crisis in 1866 in the celebrated case of Jackson. The United States Government held that an Irishman who had been naturalised in the United States ceased to be a British subject, while the British Government held otherwise. The difficulty was settled by the Act of 1870, by which it was arranged that a naturalised subject of the United States became an American citizen and renounced his Irish allegiance. He thought the difficulty could be removed by exempting from the operation of the Bill all British subjects who had become naturalised citizens of the United States. This Bill was framed merely to meet the case of the invasion of undesirable aliens from Russia and Roumania, and was never intended to apply to Irishmen who wished to revisit the country from which they sprung.

*MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said that the difficulty they were in arose from the application of the closure by compartments. He was certain that the Committee did not understand the question, and the further they discussed it the more they were getting into a fog. Before the guillotine descended at twelve o'clock the Government ought to give some further explanation as to what their intention really was. Did they intend to set up a barrier against the return of any British-born subject who wished to come back to his native country? This question not only affected Irish-Americans who desired to return to their native land to end their days, but the steel workers from Wales who had gone to America. Putting aside all questions of the Poor Law, or the sentiment about dying in the old country, he wished to know what would be the position of the thousands of the Lancashire cotton operatives who went to America seven or eight years ago to take advantage of the boom there, and the high rate of wages paid. There was now a recovery in this country from the cotton crisis, the wages of the workers had advanced 5 per cent., while the American manufacturers had pulled wages down 22½ per cent. Employers here were anxious for the return of the cotton operatives in the present condition of the trade, and these would come back assuredly as steerage passengers. These Lancashire operatives had certainly no idea that they would be prevented from returning by this Aliens Bill, and he wanted to know if the Bill would be a barrier against them returning to their old country.

MR. LEIF JONES said that strong feeling had been aroused when they were told that Irishmen, Welshmen, and Lancashire cotton operatives could not come back to the United Kingdom without passing through the hands of an immigration officer in one or other of the named ports, and that if they went anywhere else they were liable to be proceeded against as rogues and vagabonds, and be fined £5 with the alternative of three months imprisonment. He insisted that the Government would not satisfy the Committee, the House, or the country, unless they found some form of words by which any British citizen could come back freely to this country.

MR. CHURCHILL said it was a great disadvantage to the Committee that the Home Secretary should not be present to hear the debate on this important point. He ventured to say that it was incumbent on a Minister in charge of an important Bill to be present, especially when the period for its discussion had been curtailed by an arbitrary procedure. The Attorney-General might try to enlighten the Committee, but the Minister in charge of the Home Office, which would have to do with the administration of the Bill when it became law, ought to have been present to answer the arguments advanced against some of its important provisions. If the Home Secretary had been present he would have asked what the Government would lose by accepting the Amendment proposed. After all, this Bill had been represented very largely on national grounds as designed to preserve the purity of the British race. The hon. Member for Limehouse and others desired to make sure that there should be no infiltration of foreign sewage to defile the purity of the Anglo-Saxon blood! Well, this particular Amendment dealt with a class of immigrants to this country, or rather with people of British birth, who desired to return to their native land. The hon. Member for Clitheroe had given a real practical illustration of the hardships which would be imposed on the Lancashire cotton operatives who had gone over to America at a time when there was a boom in the cotton trade there. Partly from the pressure of their surroundings, and partly from economic causes, they had become naturalised subjects of the United States, but many of did not wish to separate themselves entirely from the land of their birth. He urged the Government to meet the wishes of hon. Members, believing, as he did, that not a single essential object of the Bill would be sacrificed if they gave the concession now asked for.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) said he thought the Committee was entitled to an Answer. Hon. Members who voted for the Bill never dreamt that the present position would arise. He protested against the honest British workman, who was in America or elsewhere, being prevented from returning to his own country. He wanted a straight Answer to a straight Question—namely, whether it was the intention of the Government to prevent an honest workman, be he English, Scotch, Irish, or Welsh, from returning to his own country. Every man should have the inherent right to return to his country. He was prepared to accept the word of honour of the Home Secretary that such prevention would be impossible; and he believed it would be the worst day's work hon. Gentlemen opposite ever did if they voted for the clause as it stood.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he did not think it was possible for him to be more explicit than he had been. He would, however, repeat what he had stated before. It was far from the wish of the Government to prevent honest British working men from coming back to this country, even after they had been naturalised abroad. The Government could not do otherwise than apply to all aliens, subject to exemption in the case of persons born in this country revisiting their friends, provisions which were intended not to put any difficulty in the way of working men returning to this country, but to prevent the landing of undesirable aliens.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) asked if the right hon. Gentleman would insert words to allow the British workman to return.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the Bill only aimed at the undesirable alien.

*MR. H. LAWSON (Tower Hamlets, Mile End) said he should not have intervened in the debate but for the fact that the hon. Member for Oldham, in the courteous and genial manner which had become habitual to him, imputed to him when he was supporting the Bill on national grounds that he did so in spite of his mixed origin—a mixed origin which the hon. Member shared. It seemed to him a pity that the hon. Gentleman, whose abilities they all recognised, could not take part in a debate without introducing the bitter venom of acrimonious personality.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh!

MR. CHURCHILL appealed to the Chair to allow the hon. Member full license.

*MR. H. LAWSON said that the hon. Gentleman always seemed anxious to pay off old scores. It was a matter of boast and pride with him that if he supported this Bill it was because he wished to remove the reproach of having unworthy and undesirable members foisted upon a community with which his family had been long connected. So far as the Amendment was concerned, he was quite certain that if it gave rise to any grievance on the part of Englishmen and Irishmen he certainly did not desire it. He did not wish that any Englishman or Irishman should be prevented from coming back to his mother country, but what he desired was to prevent the undesirable alien from returning to this country. The number of American citizens after naturalisation so coming was very small. He was sure they would be able to bring the Bill into conformity with that desire, which the Prime Minister had so often expressed.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he had supported the Bill with the clear and distinct understanding that it was intended to exclude the undesirable alien arriving from the East of Europe. No hon. Member thought it would be applied to persons of British birth. It was quite inconceivable that such persons would be undesirables. The Bill was introduced to prevent the arrival of uneconomic residents, who would reduce the standard of living. The Government had as yet given no promise in this respect. All they had said was that persons arriving on a holiday should not be excluded; but these were not the persons his hon. friend had in view. He wished to ask the Home Secretary whether a cotton operative who went to America, and who desired to return to this country, would be excluded, or would he be subject to examination at the port of entry, with the possibility of rejection.

MR. HARWOOD said that cotton operatives would be shocked to know that if they became naturalised in America they would forfeit the precious right of calling themselves Englishmen. It might be sentimental, but sentiment was the strongest force in politics. Everyone agreed that the undesirable alien should be kept out, but he thought that the most feather-brained Member on the Treasury Bench would not propose to exclude British-born subjects. He warned the right hon. Gentleman that it would be a serious shock to public feeling in England if it were known that a man because he went away for a short period was to forfeit the precious heritage of being a Britisher.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he had been present throughout almost the whole of the debate, and answered the Question now put in precisely the same manner that the Attorney-General had done an hour earlier. The Bill would not keep out any but undesirable aliens, and they had no desire whatever to keep out the honest British working man. He would certainly be examined, but he would have no difficulty in satisfying the inspecting officer that he was a desirable alien within the meaning of the Bill. If the Question was put whether such a man would be examined or not, he replied certainly, if he sacrificed his British nationality. The Amendment, if accepted, would admit a very large number of aliens.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight) said he wished to put the case of a British-born workman returning injured to this country, and thereby unable to support himself or his dependents, and asked the Home Secretary to make it plain that no injustice would be done in such a case. The Home Secretary did not appreciate the point. Suppose a man lost a leg in the race of life abroad, he would not be able to return under the terms of the Bill, and satisfy the immigration officer that he was able to support himself and his dependents. He might wish to return to his only refuge—the country of his birth—and was he to be debarred? The concession offered by the Home Secretary did not meet the case raised by the hon. Member for Clitheroe. They knew the Bill would go through; but they wanted to see justice done; and he appealed to the Home Secretary to state plainly what he meant.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) asked if in the supposititious case mentioned the man would be regarded as an undesirable alien, to be inspected on arrival here, and as having placed himself under a cloud by accepting another nationality? But he thought they went to war some time ago to enable the British workmen to do the very thing now condemned. The grievance against the Government of the Transvaal was that it put impediments in the way of the honest British workman which the Home Secretary now regarded as a reason for subjecting him to ignominy. If that was the position of the Government let it be understood. It would be a sorry day when that came to be regarded as the policy of a British Government.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he wished to protest against having phrases put into his mouth which he had never used. He never said a man coming back to this country after having accepted foreign nationality came back under a cloud, nor did he regard the inquiries of an immigration officer as ignominy. In order to maintain the stringency of the Bill, an alien coming to this country, whether he originally came from it or not, must come in under the system of inquiry. He saw no ignominy in that.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said that if a man became naturalised in the United States and returned to this country, he was, even without this Bill, regarded as an alien, because if he applied to be put on the register his application would be refused. Therefore, if he returned after the Bill was passed, he must put up with its provisions. The employers of labour in this country would view with the greatest satisfaction the statement of the hon. Member for Clitheroe that labour leaders were prepared to welcome men from other countries. Hitherto employers of labour had been hampered because British workmen refused to work alongside these importations. In the present condition of prosperity in Lancashire, no cotton operative returning would be under any difficulty in proving he was able to support himself.

***MR. NORMAN** asked whether a Chinaman, a British subject, coming to this country from the Straits Settlements or Hong-Kong, would be subject to inquiry.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) said that the Home Secretary had not given an Answer to the Question which had been put. He did not find fault with the absence of the right hon. Gentleman; but he was not present when he himself made his appeal.

And, it being Midnight, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, to put the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That the words 'not born in the United Kingdom' be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 173; Noes, 214. (Division List No. 271.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,N.E(York,N.R.Whitby
Buxton, Sydney Chas. (Poplar)
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptE.C(S.Andr'wsB'ghs
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman, Thomas, Captain F.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn. Herb. John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, C.E.H.(Bristol, E.)
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland,-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Seely, Maj. J.EB(IsleofWight)
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn.CR(Northants
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Fuller and Mr. Shackleton

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W)
Faber, George Denison (York.
Fellowes, Rt Hn Ailwyn Edwd.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, Maj. Evans (T'r H'mlets
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir Jas. (Staffords, N.W.
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hn. Fredk. Wm.
Laurie, Lieut-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W (Mile End
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde'
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Rt Hn. J. Parker (Lanarks

Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.JG(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,.Lt.-Col. ACE(Taunton)
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

The Chairman then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the Business allotted to the Sitting.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 16, to leave out the word 'such.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 19, to leave out the words 'immediately proceeding,' and insert the words 'proceeding within a reasonable time.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question. "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 20, at end, to insert the words 'or any passengers holding prepaid through tickets to some such destination if the master or owner of the ship by which they are brought to the United Kingdom, or by which they are to be taken away from the United Kingdom, gives security to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that, except for the purposes of transit or under other circumstances approved by the Secretary of State, they will not remain in the United Kingdom, or, having been rejected in another country, re-enter the United Kingdom, and that they will be properly maintained and controlled during their transit.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 210; Noes. 161. (Division List No. 272.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner-James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn.Sir H.
Bagot. Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A.J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Lt.-Col.HF(Middlesex)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George

Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.JA (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir J. C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, RtHnAilwynEdward
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Sir R.B(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J E(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj Evans(T'rH'mlets
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of (L'donderry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, Sir Jas.(Staffords.N.W.
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hogg, Lindsay
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herb. Merton
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn.Col.W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn. H.LW (Mile End)
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt.Hn. Walter(Bristol,S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsm'th)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Meyesy-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn.Wm. RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, RtHnJParker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col SirC.EH(Sheffield)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt. Col. A C E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G.E. (Notts.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, Wm. (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William

Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, NE(York,NRWhitby)
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C(SAndrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark,N.E.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P (Cavan,W)
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh. Alex (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland, Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway,N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn C R(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred W(Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJT (Hudd'rsfi'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES — Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Clause 9

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 204; Noes, 150. (Division List No. 273.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. SirH
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)

Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. AJ(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C.B(Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHn Gerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. AllenBenjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bowles, Lt.-Col.HF(Middlesex)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest.
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbysh.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir JosephC
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Rt. Hn. Ailwyn Edw.
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay,SirR.B.(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(WarwickS.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Gordon,Maj.Evans(T'rH'mlets
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond(Cambs)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of (L'donderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, ArthurHoward(Hanley)
Heath, SirJames (StaffordsNW
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hogg, Lindsay
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James HenryCecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt.Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh.)
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.- General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis(EdinburghW
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce, Jones, Lt. Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,HC(North'mb,Tyneside)
Smith, R.HnJParker(Lanarks)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stewart, Sir M. J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv)
Taylor, Austen (EastToxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col.Sir CEH(Sheffield)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton)
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E.(Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H.(Ashton undLyne)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N.E(York, NRWhitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt. E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E (Morley)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P (Cavan, W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke, (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Hudd'rsf'd)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Keir Hardie and Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda).

Clause 10:—

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee proceeded to a Division.

Sir A. Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia were appointed Tellers for the Ayes, but no Members being willing to act as Tellers for the Noes the Chairman declared the Ayes had it.

Question put, "That the Chairman do report the Bill, as amended, to the House."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 189; Noes, 132. (Division List No. 274.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manc'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middl'x
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas. E. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D, (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Rt Hn Ailwyn Edward
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, SW
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, Maj. Evans (T'rH m'ts
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq of ((L'nd'nd'ry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir J. (Staffords, N.W.
Henderson, Sir A (Stafford, W
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hogg, Lindsay
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. Jas. Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. F. (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, HC. (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Rt Hn J Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J G (Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles

Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir C E H(Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,N.E.(York,NRWhitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt.EC(SAndrw'sB'ghs
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hammond, John
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan,W
Kitson, Sir James
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway,N
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spencer,Rt.Hn CR (Northants
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E)
Thomas, Sir A (Glamorgan, E
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W.(York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddesf'd.

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Samuel Evans and Mr. Keir Hardie.

Bill reported, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 271.]

And, it being One of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House, without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at One o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 12th July, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London County Council (Tramways) Bill (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed.

Corbett Estate Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Central London Railway Bill (by Order). Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 2) Bill (by Order). Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNTY OF LONDON AND DISTRICT ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY BILL.

Mr. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn) proposed the Motion which stood in his name on the Paper.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order [6th July] for Committal of the Bill be read and discharged, and that the Bill be committed to a Select Committee of Nine Members, Five to be nominated by the House and Four by the Committee of Selection. That all Petitions against the Bill presented not less than four clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents, be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill. That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records. That Five be the quorum."—(*Mr. Remnant.*)

Objection being taken, the Order was deferred to to-morrow evening.

Mr. BOULNOIS (Marylebone, E.) asked whether a Committee which had been nominated to deal with this Bill, and was to sit to-morrow, could sit when a Motion of this kind was on the Agenda.

Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly it can sit and go on with its business. It does not follow that because a Motion of this kind is on the Paper it will be carried.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): To-morrow evening is allocated to Army Estimates. Will this Motion be proceeded with then?

Mr. SPEAKER: That rests with the Chairman of Ways and Means. It is a matter entirely within his discretion.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): But if the Committee goes on it will nullify this Motion altogether.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Committee must go on. It has been put down for to-morrow, counsel have been briefed and witnesses summoned. There is no reason why it should not go on. In fact it must.

Mr. REMNANT: What will be the result if the Motion is carried?

Mr. SPEAKER: The work of the Committee will be undone.

PETITIONS.

CHURCHES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition of the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, against Clause 5; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirty-third Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1903–4, containing the Report of the Medical Officer for 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 26th June; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 239.]

CIVIL SERVICES (ADDITIONAL ESTIMATE, 1905–6).

Estimate presented, of the Amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1906, for certain Expenditure, including sundry Grants in Aid, in connection with the Relief of Distress in Ireland [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 238.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3434 and 3435 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES ACTS, 1879 AND 1884.

Address for "Return showing the working of the Regulations made in 1886 for carrying out the Prosecution of Offences Acts, 1879 and 1884, with Statistics setting forth the number, nature, result, and cost of the Proceedings instituted by the Director, in accordance with those Regulations, from the 1st day of January, 1904, to the 31st day of December, 1904 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 267, of Session 1904)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Progress of Harbour Works at Avoch, Ross-shire.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord-Advocate if he will state what progress has been made with the new harbour works at Avoch, Ross-shire; and when the works are to be completed.

(*Answered by Mr. Scott Dickson.*) The contractor is bound to finish the works in nine months from 27th March, and hopes to do so.

Utility of Submarines.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty if he will lay upon the Table of the House a Report confirming the statement that the utility of submarines has been amply demonstrated during the extensive work carried out by them during the last three years, describing the nature of that work; and whether it was such as could only be accomplished by submarines.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The results of the work carried out by submarine boats are essentially confidential. Since submarines are the only torpedo craft that can approach an enemy in daylight it is evident that no other craft can accomplish the same duties.

Dock Labourers' Strike at Liverpool.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the provisions of the law as to smoking in or about any dock or shed where cargo is loaded or discharged, and of the fact that smoking takes place nightly among the imported labourers of Messrs. Harrison at Liverpool, and that these men are sleeping on improvised beds of straw and other inflammable covering, he will take such steps to put a stop to this practice so as to prevent any possibility of a conflagration.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) No, Sir; neither the Local Government Board nor the Board of Trade are prepared to act as suggested, seeing that the duty of enforcing compliance with legal provisions on the subject of smoking in or about the estate of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board does not devolve upon them.

Dock Labourers' Strike at Liverpool—Insanitary Condition of Non-Union Labourers' Quarters.

MR. NANNETTI: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware of the condition of the place where the imported non-union labourers are housed by Messrs. Harrison, of Liverpool; whether he is aware that it has been found necessary to shift them to other quarters in consequence of the danger to public health, and will he say whether a licence has been obtained by the shipping company as is required by lodging-house keepers; whether he is aware that several batches of the labourers have been sent away owing to sickness having broken out among them; whether, in view of the complaints made by the men as to the verminous state of their beds and the absence of proper means for washing themselves, he will take such steps in these matters, by surprise visits or otherwise, as will insure public safety to health of those coming in contact with these labourers.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I have received a memorandum on this subject prepared by the medical officer of health for the city of Liverpool. The memorandum does not bear out the statements referred to in the Question, but I will communicate further with the town council with respect to the matter.

Merthyr Tydvil and the Redistribution Proposals.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether under Rule 2 of his Memorandum on the Redistribution of Seats it is proposed that the new municipal borough of Merthyr Tydvil shall become a separate constituency entitled to one Member; whether the part of the parish of Vaynor, included in the existing Parliamentary boroughs of Merthyr Tydvil, will in future form part of the Parliamentary Division of Breconshire; whether the remainder of the existing Merthyr constituencies, consisting of the parish of Aberdare and part of the parish of Llanwonno will form a separate constituency; what was the population of this part of the Merthyr borough in 1901; and whether the Boundary Commission will be authorised to recommend that the boundaries of such new constituency should be extended so as to include a part of a Division of the county of Glamorgan, if they deem such extension desirable.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) It is not intended that the new municipal borough of Merthyr Tydvil should become a separate Parliamentary borough. If it did, the present Parliamentary borough should be considerably curtailed, and this would be inconsistent with the concluding part of Rule 7. The Answer, therefore, to the second and third parts of the Question is in the negative. The population of the parish of Aberdare and of the part of the parish of Llanwonno which is included in the Parliamentary borough amounted to 63,574 in 1901. In the circumstances above stated the point referred to in the last part of the Question does not appear to arise.

Newport (Mon.) and the Redistribution Proposals.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, under his Memorandum on the Redistribution of Seats, it is proposed that the county borough of Newport shall become a separate constituency apart from the towns of Monmouth and Usk; and whether Monmouth and Usk will be thrown into one of the Divisions of the county of Monmouth.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) It is not proposed that the county borough of Newport should become a separate constituency. It is intended that the Monmouth District boroughs, which at present contain part of the county borough, should be extended so as to include the whole of it.

Accidents Caused by Covered Vans.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state how the accidents with covered vans for the year ending 30th April last compare with the figures for the year prior to the introduction of the London County Council new by-law; and will he state the number of prosecutions during the year for non-compliance with this by-law.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The figures asked for in the first part of the Question are not available, and would require to be specially collected. I will obtain and forward them to the hon. Member if he attaches importance to them, but perhaps he will not think it necessary to press for them, in view of the figures given in my Answer to his Question of the 1st March † last on the same subject. No proceedings have been taken up to the present by the Metropolitan Police for contraventions of the by-law.

Sale of Furniture, etc., at Walmer Castle.

COLONEL STOPFORD SACKVILLE (Northamptonshire, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will explain the circumstances under which a sale has been effected of furniture and other articles hitherto contained in Walmer Castle; have the public any interest in the proceeds of such sale; have any objects of historical or antiquarian interest been secured for the nation; and is the castle to be kept up in future as a national museum.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The furniture which has been sold was the private property of the Lord Curzon of Kedleston, it having been purchased by him from the preceding Lord Warden. The Answer to the second paragraph is in the negative. All objects of historical and antiquarian interest have been secured for the nation. The Answer to the concluding paragraph is in the affirmative.

Salaries of Junior and Assistant Clerks in the Government Service.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that, when in 1897 the increments of junior clerks in the Office of Woods were raised, the salaries of officers actually serving were increased to the amount to which they would have been in receipt if the new scale had been in force at the date of their appointment; and will he say what were the special circumstances which prevented assistant clerks (new class) being treated similarly when the increments of that class were raised in 1902 and 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I am aware that retrospective effect was given to the increase of salaries in the case of the junior clerks of the Office of Woods. Special circumstances existed in that case which did not exist in the case of the abstractors.

Mail Service at Dungloe and Burtonport.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can arrange for an outgoing mail service from Dungloe and Burtonport, county Donegal, by the train leaving Burtonport at 9 a.m.; and also for an incoming service by the train arriving at Burtonport at 4.30 p.m.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I will make inquiry on the subject, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Army Recruiting.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War what were the numbers of recruits enlisted in each of the three months of April, May, and June for the years 1897–8, 1902–3, 1903–4, 1904–5 respectively; and what were the normal Army establishments of each of these years.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The numbers were as follows, excluding colonial corps:—

Financial Year.	1897–8.	1902–3.	1903–4.	1904–5.
April - - - - - - -	1,999	5,261	2,404	2,950
May - - - - - - -	1,981	3,630	2,235	2,107
June - - - - - - -	2,319	2,696	2,348	2,574
Normal establishment rank and file, exclusive of colonial corps.	194,293	238,030	238,738	233,511

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxlii., 18.

Rules for Management of Regimental Theatres.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the number of theatres open to the public within the walls of barracks in the United Kingdom; whether such theatres are controlled by the commanding officers; and, if so, under what regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) There are several so-called "theatres" within barracks in the United Kingdom. In most cases the "theatre" is a stage erected in the recreation room. It is the custom in the larger establishments to hire professionals for the amusement of the men. The men may introduce their friends into a recreation room. On certain occasions and special performances it is believed the public are admitted. The "theatres" are controlled by commanding officers under the "Rules for Management of Garrison and Regimental Institutes."

Education Estimates.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will put down the Education Estimates for a day before the Education Code for 1905–6 becomes operative on 1st August.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I quite hope it may be found possible to take these Estimates before Supply closes. I can, however, give no pledge as to a date for before 1st August, but I will bear the hon. Gentleman's request in mind.

Naval Works Bill—Date of Introduction.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the Naval Works Bill will be introduced.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The Bill is ready, but I cannot yet fix a day for its introduction. I will give the best notice I can.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Submarine Hatches.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether the disaster to the French submarine "Farfadet" having shown, like the casualties to the British submarines 1, 5, and 8, that the sinking of such vessels is followed by the drowning of every man under the hatches, the Admiralty will consider the necessity of fitting all our submarines, built and to be built, with hatches so made that in cases of emergency they can be quickly opened and so provide the crews with a way of escape.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The opening of hatches under water would not provide a way of escape, but would admit the water and drown the crew. Both in the case of A 8 and the "Farfadet" the cause of the accident was that hatches were open which should have been closed.

Lord Roberts' Pay.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the full pay of Commander-in-Chief is still paid to Lord Roberts, although the office was abolished more than a year ago; and, if so, under what Vote is the salary taken or under what authority, and from what source is it paid.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Lord Roberts is still in receipt of a special non-effective allowance of £5,000 a year, which is paid under Vote 14 B., Field-Marshals.

MR. BUCHANAN: Under what authority has the Secretary of State allowed the large sum of £5,000 to be paid as half-pay to a retired Field-Marshal?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Under the authority of Parliament.

MR. BUCHANAN: Is not the half-pay of a Field-Marshal regulated by the Army Pay Warrant?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes; but this was a special allowance voted by Parliament.

MR. BUCHANAN: It has not yet been voted.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): When?

MR. BUCHANAN: Is it not the fact that Vote 14 has not yet been submitted to the House, and that no statement has been made upon it?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: None of these have yet been voted, but they stand in exactly the same position as the other Votes in the Estimates.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Will this Vote be on the same footing as all other Votes in the Estimate? There never was before, and, I suppose, never afterwards will be, such a Vote. This is a Vote, as I understand it, for continuing the pay of an officer after he has been removed from his place. No work is done, and yet the pay is continued. I have no desire to criticise the services of a distinguished officer, but this is surely a most irregular proceeding.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Lord Roberts is giving his services on the Defence Committee.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Then why should not his pay be put on the Vote for the Defence Committee?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I was only answering the right hon. Gentleman's statement that Lord Roberts was doing nothing.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: But these are not the services of a Commander-in-Chief. He is continued in the pay of a Commander-in-Chief, but, whatever he may be doing, he is not doing the duties of a Commander-in-Chief. Why should he not be paid under the designation of the office that he holds?

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): Are the other members of the Defence Committee receiving £5,000 per annum?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir. It will be competent for the House of Commons to reject this or any other Vote. This Vote was put forward by the Government because they thought it was suitable treatment to meet the case.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think it right to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the explanation of the situation is that because Lord Roberts was treated almost with indignity by the right hon. Gentleman in being summarily dismissed from his appointment, this is a *douceur*, and the British taxpayer has to pay £5,000 a year until the end of his term of appointment—I think there are two years to run yet—in order to atone for the discourtesy of the right hon. Gentleman?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I protest against the unjust and unfounded remarks of the right hon. Gentleman, for which there is absolutely no particle of foundation. Every step was taken with Lord Roberts' agreement and consent, and Lord Roberts was never made, and never could be made, the object of any discourtesy on my part.

MR. BUCHANAN: In view of the fact that not until this moment was the House made aware that under Vote 14 Lord Roberts is receiving this sum, may I ask the Prime Minister whether he will secure to the House an opportunity of discussing Vote 14 of the Army Estimates?

MR. DALZIEL: Are we to take the statement of the Secretary of State for War that the House will have an opportunity of considering this matter as a pledge that the House will have an opportunity of discussing it, and that it will not be guillotined?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The hon. Member must not misrepresent me. It is not in my power to say what opportunities the House will be given.

MR. DALZIEL: You have just said it.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I said the House will have an opportunity of rejecting this Vote.

Mr. BUCHANAN: May I ask the Prime Minister to say whether the House will be given an opportunity of discussing Vote 14?

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): The hon. Member and the whole House have had the Estimates before them since they were laid some months ago.

Mr. BUCHANAN: But there is no indication of this Vote.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: In those months they have discussed at quite unexampled length various questions connected with the Army Estimates. They have been forewarned that it is really impossible to give more than another day to the discussion of the Army Estimates. They have insisted that it should be occupied in the first place by the Volunteer Vote and in the second place by the Secretary of State's Vote. If I am informed on the authority of the right hon. Gentleman opposite that there is a desire that the order for to-morrow shall be altered, of course altered it will be. But I am not in a position to offer two days more for the Army Estimates in addition to those already given.

Mr. DALZIEL: Has the right hon. Gentleman taken into account the fact that the Estimates are absolutely misleading in regard to this matter?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The statement in the Vote is perfectly clear:—"Field-Marshals, one at £1,300, one at £2,000, and one at £5,000 a year."

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman out of what money this pay is being paid?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I suppose it is paid from the source from which the salaries of all the officials of the War Department are paid.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the continued payment of £5,000 a year to the late Commander-in-Chief after his office had been abolished.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: The hon. Member can hardly bring this matter within the rules of urgency. This payment to Lord Roberts has been down on the Estimates certainly since March or April, and it cannot, therefore, be said to be urgent.

Mr. BUCHANAN said it was impossible for any one to know that Lord Roberts' salary was borne on Vote 14 until it was so stated by the Secretary for War that afternoon. The House was certainly not aware of the fact before this, and now they were told by the Prime Minister that they would have no opportunity of discussing it.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: The matter was brought to the notice of the House last year; I have a distinct recollection of the statement being made in reply to a Question.

Medical Examination of Volunteers.

Mr. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what financial provision he proposes to make to enable officers commanding Volunteer battalions to defray the expense of medically re-examining the men under their command.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: There is no reason to suppose that the service will appreciably add to the necessary expenditure of Volunteer corps, and it is not, therefore, proposed to grant any special allowance. But the matter is receiving consideration.

Mr. FULLER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Volunteer medical officers have private practice which would be considerably interfered with by their having to examine hundreds of men?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I understand that in many cases arrangements are being made by commanding officers to have the men examined in camp.

Ammunition Grants for Volunteers.

Mr. FULLER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the allowance of ball ammunition per man per annum in the Volunteer force for practice and competitions, apart from the allowance made for the annual course of musketry.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The State makes an annual grant to every infantry Volunteer of ninety rounds. The musketry regulations permit of ten rounds of this ammunition being expended in practice and competition. Further, it is a custom of Volunteer corps to utilise for matches the ammunition in hand on completion of the regulation and repetition practices.

Military Prison Regulations.

Mr. BRIGHT (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any changes in the rules relating to military prisons have recently been made with the view to improve the condition of military prisoners; and, if so, what are those changes.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No change has been recommended by the Inspector of Military Prisons and none has been made. There are, however, certain points with regard to prison discipline which are under consideration, with a view to possible amendment.

Mr. BRIGHT: Will the right hon. Gentleman at the same time take into consideration the question of corporal punishment?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is one of the questions under consideration.

Canadian Cattle—Embargo on Importation.

Sir JOHN LENG: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has observed that the Canadian Minister of Agriculture, speaking on Friday in the House of Commons at Ottawa, declared that the embargo on the importation of Canadian cattle into the United Kingdom is detrimental to Canadian trade, and a financial injury to the people of the Dominion; that he did not hesitate to declare the embargo an unfriendly act to Canada, and that it shows a lack of consideration for those bonds of Imperial unity which should be as dear to the mother country as to Canada; and whether, as the Canadian Minister added that nothing would appeal more to the Canadian people than if the motherland were to remove the present stigma from Canadian cattle, he will bring these statements under the consideration of the Government with a view to meeting the representations of the Dominion Parliament.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): I have seen a telegraphic report of the speech referred to by the hon. Member; but I regret that I can add nothing to the reply which I gave to his Question on this subject on June 7th†.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): May I ask whether this embargo was imposed not merely in order to keep out diseased cattle, but also as an acceptable form of protection for the British cattle-breeder?

Mr. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock): Is it not a fact that before the embargo was imposed we constantly had foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia attacking our cattle?

Mr. LYTTELTON: That Question should be addressed to the President of the Board of Agriculture.

Cost of Repressing Riots in the Rand Mines.

Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, as a result of negotiations between the Chamber of Mines at Johannesburg and the Government, two troops of constabulary are to be stationed in the East and West Rand to assist the authorities in coping with disturbances among the Chinese; and whether the whole or any part of the cost involved in this arrangement will be borne by the mineowners.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have not received information to this effect.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxlvii., 946.

The Transvaal War Contribution.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if the Estimates for the year ending June 30th, 1906, presented to the Transvaal Legislative Council by Sir Arthur Lawley on July 8th last contain any provision for the £30,000,000 war contribution, or any part thereof; and if any steps have been taken to prevent the allocation of the revenue from the Premier Diamond Mine to other purposes until the promised contribution has been made. May I point out that the sum referred to in the Question—£400,000—would exactly provide a sinking fund for the first loan of ten millions?

Mr. LYTTELTON: The Estimates have not yet reached me, but they will not contain any such provision. The war contribution loan has not so far been charged by law upon the revenues of the colony, as that is a matter which, as has already been fully explained to the House, has been left for the decision of the new Elective Assembly. The Answer to the latter part of the hon. Member's Question is in the negative.

Mr. WHITLEY: Then are we to understand that the revenue from the Premier Diamond Mine is to be allocated to new purposes, and not for the service of the loan?

Mr. LYTTELTON: The Government portion of the Premier Mine's profit is allocated by statute.

Mr. WHITLEY: Allocated to what?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I must refer the hon. Member to the statute.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Do not the Government propose to take any steps to procure the £30,000,000, on the faith of which the £35,000,000 loan was guaranteed?

Mr. LYTTELTON: The circumstances have been fully debated on many occasions, and the Government have stated their views.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: They do not, I gather, propose to take any steps.

The Royal Commission on the Motor-Car Act.

Sir CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board when he will appoint the Committee of Inquiry on the Motor Act.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): The inquiry will be conducted by a Royal Commission, and steps are now being taken with a view to its appointment.

Sir CARNE RASCH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that they are using broken bottles and such like arguments in East Anglia? The matter should not be unduly delayed.

Watches not Gold or Silver Plate.

Mr. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the recent case of the Wardens and Commonalty of the Mystery of Goldsmiths of the City of London *v.* William Wyatt, in which it has been held that a watch is not gold or silver plate within the meaning of Section 59 of The Customs Act, 1842; and whether he will introduce legislation to deal with this state of the law.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Bonar Law, Glasgow, Blackfriars): My attention has been called to the case, and I understand that the Goldsmiths' Company have under their consideration the question of an appeal from the decision referred to.

Scottish Board of Manufactures.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate when he proposes to introduce the promised Bill to carry out the recommendations of the Committee on the Board of Manufactures.

The LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton): I hope to be able to introduce this Bill next week.

Kindergarten Instruction in Irish Schools.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education have made any regulations under which teachers in schools and King's scholars in training colleges should be trained in the teaching of kindergarten; and, if so, what are these regulations.

MR. BOLAND: I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state at what date did the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland first employ an organiser of kindergarten for the schools; in how many schools has this organiser and her assistants been engaged up to the present time; and in how many years do the Commissioners expect that the teaching of this important subject will be properly organised in all their schools.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): No special regulations have been made, but the Commissioners have made provision for kindergarten instruction in suitable schools; and the organisation of such schools, as well as the instruction of teachers in the subject, is being effected by a staff of organising teachers. Instruction in kindergarten has also been given to teachers in the training colleges since 1883. The organiser of kindergarten was appointed in June, 1903, since when seventy-five schools have been fully organised by her and her assistants. The Commissioners have formed no estimate of the length of time necessary to organise all infant schools. The subject, however, is now taught in 2,138 schools.

Mixed Schools in Ireland.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to Rule 136 (2), (a), (b), (c) of the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, and will he explain on what grounds the regulations made in them are considered necesary; and will he say whether, when a manager objects to have grown girls taught with grown boys by a master only with no adult female in the room, the Commissioners will persist in forcing this arrangement on him.

MR. WALTER LONG: I have read the rule referred to, the reasons for which are sufficiently shown by the wording of the rule itself. In reply to the latter inquiry, the Commissioners consider it very important that in mixed schools under a master there should be a female teacher also. Rule 86 provides for this.

Banogue National School, Limerick.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether in the national school in Banogue, county Limerick, the separation of the pupils into practically two schools, of which the junior for boys and girls on one floor is conducted by the mistress, the senior for boys and girls is conducted by the master on another floor, has been made by the direction or at the suggestion of the inspector; and, if so, whether the manager of the school was consulted on the arrangement; if not, by what authority the arrangement is carried out.

MR. WALTER LONG: I have nothing to add to the full replies which have already been given to the hon. Member's similar Questions of May 25th † and June 5th.‡

Croker Estate, County Limerick.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that arrangements as to sale and purchase have been made on the Croker Estate, in the parish of Herbertstown and adjoining parishes, in the county of Limerick, as between the landlord, Mr. Courtney Croker, and the tenants, and can he say how far these arrangements have been carried; can he say whether the Estates Commissioners have before them an application from Mr. Michael Power for reinstatement to his farm in Moohane, from which his father, the late Richard Power, was evicted over fifteen years ago; is he aware that the man who took up that farm is prepared to leave it in favour of Power if he gets fair compensation; and, if so, will he recommend Power's case as one for immediate settlement.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxlvi., 1399.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxlvii., 715

MR. WALTER LONG: No proceedings for the sale of this estate have yet been instituted before the Commissioners. The application which has been lodged by Michael Power will be considered if the estate should come before the Commissioners.

Male Students at the Marlborough Street Training College.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total number of male students applied and appointed respectively in Marlborough Street Training College in each of the sessions 1902-3, 1903-4, 1904-5.

MR. WALTER LONG: In 1902-3, 113 applied and 84 were admitted; in 1903-4, 81 applied and 50 were admitted; and in 1904-5, 110 applied and 60 were admitted.

English Teachers in Irish Schools.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the names of the English teachers who are stated by the Board of National Education to have sought employment under that Board; and how many of them were Irishmen who for family or personal reasons wished to return to their own country.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Commissioners cannot say how many teachers from England have sought employment in Irish national schools, but there are at least nine teachers certificated in England who are now employed in Irish schools, and there are at least thirty-five holding Irish certificates who have been employed in England, but are now employed in Irish schools.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Miss Colgan.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, (1) whether the Estates Commissioners have aquired untenanted land in Kildare, Wicklow, or Meath; (2) whether they have received an application for reinstatement, or an equivalent farm, from Miss Colgan, who was evicted from her holding near Kildare; (3) and whether, in the event of the Estates Commissioners purchasing untenanted land in the said counties, they will take into favourable consideration Miss Colgan's application.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Answer to the first query is in the negative, and to the second and third in the affirmative.

Carriage-Horse Breeding in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the horse-breeding schemes of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction do not include any provision for the encouragement of the breeding of carriage horses; and whether, in view of the fact that it is mainly this class of horse that is bred in Armagh and the adjoining counties, he will adopt measures to encourage the breeding of carriage horses by grants equivalent to those allotted to the breeders of hunters.

MR. WALTER LONG: I assume that my hon. friend's Question refers to the breed known as hackneys. It has been decided by the Department, on the advice of their Special Advisory Committee on Horse-Breeding, that it would be injurious to the horse-breeding industry in Ireland to subsidise this breed from public funds.

Tobacco-Growing in Ireland.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the total amount expended on tobacco-growing experiments in Ireland by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, including the cost of those carried out at Glasnevin model farm; and whether it is the intention of the Department to spend any and, if so, what sum on the erection of tobacco barns with heating plant this year, and in what parts of Ireland will these experiments be pursued.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The net amount so expended, during the five years ended March 31st last, was £2,994. It is intended to erect two barns this year, one at Tagoat, county Wexford, and the other near Tullamore, King's County, at an estimated cost of about £900 each.

Disappearance of Constable Masterton, Royal Irish Constabulary.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state upon what date Constable Masterton, a fugitive from justice, disappeared from Maryborough; whether he was living in the police barrack; and whose duty it was to report his disappearance.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Constable Masterton disappeared from Maryborough, where he was living in the police barracks, on June 30th. It was the duty of the district inspector to report his disappearance, and he did so.

Mr. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): How soon after the man's disappearance?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I cannot say. I imagine immediately.

Mr. DELANY: The man disappeared on Friday. The assizes at which he should have surrendered were held on the following Wednesday. What steps were taken in the meantime to trace him?

Mr. WALTER LONG: He was on his own recognisance, and there was therefore no power to arrest him.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): But surely there was power to keep him under observation. In view of the fact that more than one officer of the Royal Irish Constabulary under a serious charge has recently absconded, what steps were taken in this matter?

Mr. WALTER LONG: Several officers have not absconded since I have been in this office.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: But several have within the last two or three years.

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Sheridan, for instance.

Mr. WALTER LONG: I will inquire.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman institute a sworn inquiry?

Mr. WALTER LONG: Into what?

Mr. CULLINAN: Into whether the police assisted this man to escape.

Mr. WALTER LONG: I very much doubt whether such an inquiry would be the best means of arriving at the information desired. I cannot answer the Question until I have heard from the Inspector-General what steps were taken. If anything has not been done which ought to have been done, the hon. Member may be sure it will be looked into.

Mr. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): Is not a man under his own recognisances kept under observation?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I am not aware, but there are often cases in this country where accused persons fail to answer to their bail.

Constable Cryan, Royal Irish Constabulary.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Constable Cryan, lately stationed at Mountmellick, is still doing duty as a peace officer; and whether he can state if the damages and costs given against Constables Masterson and Cryan in the High Courts, amounting to £250, have been paid; and, if so, by whom.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The Answer to the first Question is in the affirmative, and to the second in the negative.

Administration of the Irish Land Act—Confidential Instructions.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any of the instructions or regulations contained in the confidential correspondence addressed to the Estates Commissioners in connection with the administration of the Land

Act, 1903, are still in force, or have they all lapsed since the issue of the new regulations.

MR. WALTER LONG: Any instructions which may have been contained in the confidential correspondence referred to are not now in force, but have been superseded by the regulations of the 4th instant.

Irish Land Act, 1903,—Section 5.

MR. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the new regulations issued to the Estates Commissioners are complete; if so, or in any event, are the Commissioners, when interpreting Section 5 of the Land Act, 1903, now to inquire into the equity as between purchaser and vendor to arrive at a decision as to whether the agreed price is equitable.

MR. WALTER LONG: The regulations do not in any way deal with the construction of Section 5 of the Act. The proper construction of that section was in effect decided by Mr. Justice Meredith in the case of King-Harman, landlord, and Eliza Hayes, tenant, on June 8th last.

Kerry Evicted Tenants.

MR. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in consequence of the direct action of the Estates Commissioners, any evicted tenant has been reinstated in his old home or given a farm elsewhere out of the 411 cases of evicted tenants in the county of Kerry in which applications have been sent to the Estates Commissioners; and, if so, can he give the names in such cases.

MR. WALTER LONG: No, Sir.

Dublin College of Science—Engineering School.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that Mr. Aston Webb, the English architect, when preparing the plans for the new College of Science in Dublin had overlooked the necessity of providing accommodation for the engineering school, for which school a sum of £25,000 had been ear-marked in connection with the college; and whether he will undertake that this sum will be made available for requisition which may be made upon it in connection with the present engineering school and not diverted to any other purposes.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): The engineering school is being erected on a separate and more convenient site, but the equipments of the school will be provided for in precisely the same manner as if it had been included in the main buildings of the new College of Science.

MR. MOONEY: Have not the Department been requisitioned for the money already?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I am not aware of it.

MR. MOONEY: It is so.

Irish National School Building Plans.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the new plans for the building of national schools will be issued; and can he state whether it is proposed to make a grant of more than two-thirds of the cost.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I am expecting an early settlement of this matter, but as yet I have nothing to add to the several replies I have given earlier in the session.

Irish Land Purchase Act.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if his attention has been drawn to the report of the Irish Law Incorporated Society, which states that more money is wanted for the satisfactory working of the Purchase Act; if he has considered the desirability of paying partly in bonds instead of wholly in cash such vendors as are willing to accept bonds; and if bonds can be issued for this purpose which would be redeemed at par by Government in from two to five years.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I have received a copy of the resolution passed by the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland upon this subject, which is now engaging the serious attention of the Government. I cannot at present make any statement on the matter; but my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary will communicate the views of the Government to the House as soon as he is in a position to do so.

COLONEL NOLAN: Will it be this session?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir.

Foreign Consuls in Ireland.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give the names of the foreign countries which are represented by Consuls in Ireland; and can he state how many Consuls have been appointed by the United States, France, Spain, and Germany to look after the trade interests of those countries respectively in Ireland.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): The following foreign countries are represented by Consular officers:—Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hayti, Honduras, Italy, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden and Norway, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The United States of America have appointed ten Consular officers; France eight; Spain six; Germany seven.

MR. BOLAND: If foreign countries think it desirable to appoint Consuls in Ireland why do not the Government collect statistics in the same way with regard to Irish trade?

EARL PERCY: Our Consuls cannot supply statistics which foreign governments do not publish.

Ireland and the Redistribution Scheme.

MR. O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in view of his forthcoming Redistribution Resolutions, if he will circulate as a Parliamentary Paper those clauses of the Act of Union between Great Britain and Ireland which deal with the Parliamentary representation of Ireland in the House of Commons.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): And will the right hon. Gentleman circulate at the same time the 5th Article of the Act which provides for the preservation of the Established Church. Is not that also an essential part of the Act of Union?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not see any reason for circulating this Paper. It is open for any Gentleman to make himself acquainted with the provisions of the Act of Union. If we were to circulate it with a commentary on the Act of Union, with or without the approval of hon. Gentlemen, it would become a controversial Paper.

MR. O'KELLY: In view of the fact that the Act of Union will be almost continually referred to in the discussion of the Resolutions, will the right hon. Gentleman have the full text of the Act circulated?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am surprised to hear the hon. Member say the Act of Union will be constantly quoted. I do not think, taking all the circumstances into account, that it is very relevant to the Resolution.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Does the reply of the right hon. Gentleman mean that he has ceased to regard as of any importance this Act, which is spoken of in this country and by the right hon. Gentleman and his political friends as a treaty?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I take, perhaps, an even more favourable view of the Act of Union than the hon. Gentleman, who, with his friends, was an enthusiastic supporter of a breach of the most precise portion of the Act of Union relating to the Irish Church.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Really that statement must not be allowed to pass.

The Act of Union is regarded in this country as a treaty between two nations. One portion of that treaty has been varied with the consent of the two nations. It is not a question whether I or my political associates enthusiastically approved of that variation. The fact is that portion of the Act of Union was varied by the consent of the two parties to the treaty.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not agree with that version. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Of course not.] The portion of the Act of Union to which the hon. Gentleman refers was made with those who belonged to the religion of which the Established Irish Church was the recognised ecclesiastical organ. I do not think it would be proper on this occasion to argue the question, but I dissent from the hon. Gentleman's views.

MR JOHN REDMOND: I recognise that this is not a possible or proper occasion for argument. But the right hon. Gentleman himself has introduced this question, and I must be allowed to point out that the treaty was not made with Protestants, or the representatives of Protestants in Ireland; it was a treaty made between the two nations on the authority of the representatives of the two nations, and the representatives of the two nations varied that portion of the Act of Union.

MR. O'KELLY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will state what the Parliamentary representation of Ireland would be if determined on the basis of population at the time the Act of Union was carried.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I do not perfectly comprehend the meaning of the hon. Member's Question. If he asks me, as perhaps he does, what would be the representation of Ireland under this Resolution—[NATIONALIST cries of "No."] Does he want to ask me what the representation of Ireland would be under this Resolution if the population of Ireland now was what it was at the time of the Union? [NATIONALIST cries of "No."] The Answer is that probably the representation would be about the same. I understand that is not his meaning. Perhaps he will explain his meaning.

MR. O'KELLY said he wished to know what the Parliamentary representation of Ireland would have been at the time of the Act of Union if it had been determined on the basis of population.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Does the hon. Gentleman want me to put back—[NATIONALIST cries of "Answer the Question" and "You know what we want."] It is not at all clear. Does he want me to consider what would have been the representation in 1800 if the population of Ireland had been what it is now? [NATIONALIST cries of "No."]

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Without the slightest acrimony, may I respectfully submit to the right hon. Gentleman that a more clear and precise Question was never put to a Minister? He cannot pretend that he does not understand it. The Question of my hon. friend is this—"If population had been taken as the basis of representation at the time of the Union, what would have been the number of Members Ireland would have been entitled to at that time?"

MR. A. J. BALFOUR. Clearly she would have been entitled to a great many more Members than she actually received. In other words, Ireland was far worse treated by the Act of Union than she will be treated by the Resolution.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I am precluded by the rules of order from entering into an argument; but I protest against the right hon. Gentleman's making an argument that I am powerless to answer.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is mistaken. He asked me a Question, and I was perfectly justified in the Answer that I made.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I submit that the right hon. Gentleman in answering a Question is not entitled to enter into an argument unless we are entitled to answer that argument.

Subsequently,

Mr. JOHN REDMOND asked when the discussion of the Redistribution Resolution would be continued after its introduction. The right hon. Gentleman would be the first to admit that the question raised was one of the gravest constitutional importance, and he respectfully submitted that a question of that character could not properly be discussed in what the right hon. Gentleman had himself once called the interstices of debate. When did the right hon. Gentleman propose to take up the serious discussion of the Resolution, and would it be continued day by day?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot give a promise to take the Resolution from day to day. It is impossible to do so, because under the orders we have passed with regard to the Aliens Bill there are some stages of that measure to be interpolated. I propose to take the discussion of the Redistribution Resolution on Tuesday morning next and on Wednesday morning next. I quite recognise that there are disadvantages in any break of continuity; but these disadvantages have constantly to be undergone with regard to other discussions. I will make them as small as I can; but there are other interests which I have to consider.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the discussion will be resumed after the morning sitting on Wednesday? Will it be on the following Monday, and then from day to day? And is there any precedent for a matter of this constitutional importance being dealt with in this way?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know that there is a precise parallel, nor could I come to any conclusion on that point without very laborious investigation. But the procedure I am suggesting to the House will not, I am convinced, be inconvenient, and I think the allocation of business which I shall propose is one which ought to meet with general approval. At any rate, as far as next week is concerned, Tuesday and Wednesday mornings will be devoted to this Motion.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Does the right hon. Gentleman propose to inform the House beforehand how many hours he proposes to devote to the discussion of this constitutional question, and the precise moment when the guillotine will fall?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I should hope the House will have the self-control to deal with this question within reasonable limits. In that case, I trust the contingency which the hon. Gentleman contemplates will not come to pass.

The Government's Fiscal Policy.

Mr. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government's policy of fiscal reform includes the imposition of a general tariff upon imports from foreign countries.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have nothing to add to the statements I have made on this subject. The hon. Gentleman is perfectly aware that the present Government do not intend to make any proposals on this subject during the present Parliament.

Mr. BLACK: Does the hon. Gentleman, therefore, think it fitting that the Government policy——

***Mr. SPEAKER**: Order, order! We have had our attention called to argumentative Answers, but if the hon. Gentleman insists on putting argumentative Questions he must expect argumentative Answers.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: The Answers are so argumentative?

Mr. BLACK: And unsatisfactory.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: Order, order!

Scottish Churches and Education Bills.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the trouble that is every day increasing in Scotland through the delay in passing the measure for settling the Church difficulty, he will devote the first available day to the Committee stage.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am anxious to pass this Bill rapidly into law; and if it is passed, as I have no doubt it will be in the present session, I trust that all the good consequences which we hope will flow from it will be realised in time to prevent any serious inconvenience.

MR. CATHCART WASON asked whether, in view of his statement that he would be guided by Scottish opinion with reference to proceeding with the Church Bill on Friday, and that a great majority of Scottish Members were keenly anxious that the Committee stage of the Bill should be taken that day in order to put an end to ever-increasing strife, the Prime Minister would reconsider his decision as to business on that day.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have taken much trouble to arrange business, and, on the whole, I adhere to the course, the knowledge of which I took some trouble to diffuse among hon. Gentlemen last night. I was not in a position to make the statement at the close of business.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think the right hon. Gentleman should take some steps to diffuse this information other than by the subterranean methods to which he alludes. As I am personally in favour of going on with the Churches Bill and not of wasting a day in entering upon a new stage of a Bill which has no chance of being passed this session, it cannot be said that I or those with whom I act have been consulted on this matter. If the right hon. Gentleman has in some subterranean way arrived at an opposite opinion the least he could do would be to state it to the House and not refer to it as if it were known generally among hon. Members.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman is speaking under some misapprehension. As soon as I realised that I should be unable, owing to the divisions going on after one o'clock, to make the statement at the close of the House last night which I had promised, I communicated with the Opposition Whip and all the hon. Members interested whom I could reach, and asked them to diffuse the information as widely as they could.

MR. CATHCART WASON: Has not the right hon. Gentleman said he would be guided by Scottish opinion in this matter?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The responsibility rests with me, and although the opinion of Scottish Members has to be taken into account, the idea that I should take a plebiscite never entered into my mind.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Is the reason the right hon. Gentleman has come to that conclusion that it has been communicated to him that he cannot keep his men here on Friday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Is it, then, that the right hon. Gentleman is aware of that fact without it having to be communicated to him?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is an argumentative Question.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: No, it is not.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): May I ask whether it is to be concluded that the right hon. Gentleman means to carry the Scotch Education Bill this session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: How can I answer that Question till I see what progress is made?

MR. PIRIE: Has not the right hon. Gentleman absolute power to pass the measure if he chooses this session?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

MR. PIRIE: I deny that.

The Unemployed Workmen Bill.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that demonstrations calling for the passing of the Unemployed Workmen Bill, with Amendments, have been held in London, Manchester, and elsewhere; and whether, in view of this expression of opinion, he will now give an undertaking that the Bill will be passed this session.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot give the undertaking which the hon. Gentleman asks for.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: Can the right hon. Gentleman give an undertaking that he has the intention of passing the Bill this session?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. I will give no pledge on the subject at all.

Mr. PIRIE: Then the right hon. Gentleman is playing with the House and with the nation.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): May I ask whether, having regard to the general disinclination to take the Scotch Education Bill on Friday, the right hon. Gentleman will substitute the Unemployed Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think there is the general disinclination to which the hon. Member refers.

Mr. CROOKS: May I follow my Question up with another? Are we only to have such legislation as there is sufficient disturbance in the country to demand? That is the excuse for taking the Churches Bill.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE asked leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the refusal of the Government to give a definite undertaking of their intention to pass the Unemployed Workmen Bill this session.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member, I think, fails for want of definiteness. The Government cannot give any undertaking to pass a Bill; it is the House that passes Bills; and the Government cannot have power to bind the House to pass a particular Bill. The Bill stands upon the Order Paper, and it may be reached and may be passed in due course.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: May I point out that my Motion refers to the refusal of the Government to give an undertaking of their intention to pass the Bill, and to give adequate time for that purpose. If they were prepared to give time for the purpose that would be evidence of their intention, but the Prime Minister has refused to give time.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: May I submit that the refusal of the Government to allocate time is a definite matter as well as urgent and important.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, on a point of order, asked whether the fact that any Bill was not treated precisely as some individual wished had ever been made a matter of public importance. He doubted whether it would be possible to carry on the business of the House if that were so.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: It is your own Bill.

Mr. CROOKS: I want to urge this upon you, Sir. Nothing could be of more importance for the House of Commons to discuss than the case of honest workmen desirous of finding means of getting a livelihood.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: May I put this point. Great demonstrations have been held, and if this Bill is not carried into law this session there is a good chance of riots and disturbances taking place throughout the country. [Ministerial cries of "Order!"] Well-fed beasts opposite may well shout "Order."

*Mr. SPEAKER: I have already said that, in my judgment, this matter does not come within the rule.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: This is a Government Bill—["Order"]—it is public business of State, and I declare it to be the first business of the Government to legislate to prevent the breaking of the public peace. There is a danger of that, and that is what I hope will take place if this Bill does not become law.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Bring them down here and clear out the House.

The Colliery Explosion.

SIR ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorganshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary for the Home Office whether steps will be immediately taken to initiate an inquiry into the sad disaster that has occurred in the Rhondda Valley.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.): I take the opportunity to express the regret of the Home Office at the disaster. The Answer is that the mines inspector for the Cardiff district, in which the colliery is, proceeded to the scene as soon as possible, and is now supervising the necessary work. He has sent the following telegram, in which he says that "considerable progress in the exploration of the working of the colliery has been made; seventy-seven bodies have been discovered, and twenty-seven have been brought to the surface. I fully expect the whole of the working will be explored by to-morrow. The loss of life is expected to be 119. The cause of the explosion has not yet been ascertained. (Signed) Gray, Mines Inspector." I may say that the Home Office will be represented by counsel at the inquest, when it is hoped that all the facts relating to the circumstances of the disaster will be ascertained.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda): May I ask that on this occasion they will see that a legal gentleman who has had some experience in these inquiries will be sent down to South Wales? It would be better if a gentleman who could speak Welsh was selected, but I think it is essential that he should at least understand the Welsh language.

*MR. COCHRANE: I have told the hon. Member that counsel will be sent down, and I will draw the attention of the Home Secretary to the further point he has made.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: May I ask the Prime Minister whether he will agree to a Motion being passed by the House expressing their sympathy with the relatives of those who have suffered so greviously in this terrible disaster?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am quite sure no such Resolution is required in order to show how deeply the House feels this sudden tragedy which has overcome so many of our fellow-countrymen. I think the hon. Gentleman will feel not only that no such Resolution is required on the present occasion, but that if the precedent were set which he suggests, it would be impossible to distinguish between cases when such a Resolution was really fitting and those cases where it was at least doubtful whether this House should pass such a Resolution. Those doubtful cases would necessarily lead to debates which would be essentially painful in their character; and I should therefore deprecate a precedent which might be inconvenient, and which would add nothing, I think, to the expression of deep emotion which we all feel.

The South Wales Coalfield.

MR. LLEWELLYN (Somersetshire, N.): I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury a Question of which I have given him private notice. It is whether there is any foundation for the rumour that a foreign syndicate has been formed for acquiring possession of the South Wales coalfield, and thus for securing control of those sources of coal supply which are a prime necessity for the maintenance of the British Navy, and, if the statement be correct, what action His Majesty's Government propose to take under the circumstances.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have heard a rumour tending in the direction of which my hon. friend has spoken. Whether that rumour has any solid foundation I am not at present in a position to say; but that we could not remain indifferent spectators of any transaction which handed over to a foreign syndicate or foreign Government the unique source of our naval mobility must be, I think, plain to the House, and so unexampled a proceeding would unquestionably require exceptional treatment.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that none of the collieries mentioned in connection with the proposed combine are supplying coal to the Navy?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not so fully acquainted as the hon. Gentleman with what is going on. If he will convey any information he possesses to me I shall be grateful.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Second Report brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 240.]

CHURCHES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [4th July], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'That,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'in the opinion of this House no approval should be given to any measure which has the effect of giving an Established Church the right to change or modify its creeds, or any formula of subscription thereto, without such change or modification being submitted to and specifically sanctioned by Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*MR. COMPTON RICKETT (Scarborough), who was speaking in support of the Amendment on the adjournment of the debate, resumed his speech in support of the Amendment. He said that objection was strongly felt by many in Scotland, and by many more Nonconformists in England, to the introduction of Clause 5 into this Bill. He was fully aware that the differences in Scotland between the Established Church and the Free Churches were not so marked as those in England; they were more largely those appertaining to the ecclesiastical rather than to the theological side, whereas between the Church of England and Nonconformity the differences were theological as well as ecclesiastical. At the same time the principle involved was the same. He was quite aware that the Established Church in Scotland had claimed for a long time the right to modify or regulate its own creeds, but he supposed it was the judgment given in the case of the United Free Church that had startled her persuading her friends to introduce this clause into the present Bill. They had endangered their claim by the course they had pursued. They had thought it right to raise in that House the whole question of Establishment by asking the State to give them powers which they were supposed already to possess. The religious difficulties which had provoked the trouble in Scotland at the present time, and which had brought about the introduction of this Bill, were contained in the 5th Clause, because really at the bottom of the whole difficulty, as he was informed, was a question of doctrine rather than of money.

The Bill had been introduced on the ground that it affected questions of property which required immediate solution, but, in fact, the movement which had been going on for a long time in the Church of Scotland had proved too much for the consistency of many of its ministers and some of its laity. Endeavouring to put themselves right, they had provoked a revolution, and had brought under the purview of this House the whole question of their position. The Bill had nothing to do with the Established Church except it were argued that if they were to give freedom to one Church it would be right to give it to all. He would like to point out that a great number of the English Nonconformist Churches had trust deeds similar to those which had given rise to this controversy in Scotland; that they were tied hard and fast by articles and formulæ from 1662 to 1690. Many of these Churches were already feeling the strain, and sooner or later would have to appeal to Parliament for relief. When that time came it would be pointed out that Scotland was willing to grant freedom to her spiritual brotherhood, and it would be argued that they ought to make the same concessions to the Church of England freeing her from bonds forged 250 years ago; bonds entirely contrary to the spirit of the age, practically ignored by the Free Churches and Established alike. On this account they were bound closely to inquire into the reasons claimed for this relief to be granted to the Established Church of Scotland.

On the part of those whom he represented he disclaimed the idea that their opposition was inspired by jealousy of the supremacy of one Church, or of resentment against certain concessions. Their feeling was much more serious and deep. It was with surprise he observed that many in Scotland who entertained the same views with regard to Establishment as the members of the Free Churches of England were prepared to allow the Second Reading of this Bill, when they must be aware, and were aware, that Clause 5 embodied a grave principle. They held that there were two spheres—the sphere of the Church and the sphere of the State. The Church had an undoubted right to regulate its formularies and maintain its own order and discipline. Any claim she made to influence the State should be through individuals rather than by national methods, atmospheric rather than legal. He acknowleged that it was the duty of Parliament to listen to any appeal made to it by the Church of Scotland to modify or regulate her formularies. But, as matters stood, Parliament had not been told whether the Church of Scotland really desired that this power should be exercised—entrusted to a chance majority, it might be a majority of one. Parliament was bound to see that the interest of the minority in the Church was protected; that it should not be possible for a small, and perhaps uncertain, majority to make it difficult for the minority, on a matter of conscience, to remain in the Church of their fathers. To his mind the clause did not seem to be seriously drawn.

The freedom offered was either of no consequence, a matter of words, or it would go to the very foundation of the creed of the Church of Scotland. There were hundreds in the ministry who would never dare publicly to state their adherence to particular clauses in the Westminster Confession of Faith because they knew that whatever may have been the value of such a declaration to a past age it would be outrageous to endeavour to give effect to such statements in the present. They were asked to recognise a revolutionary movement, the complement of the Reformation. That great deliverance was a moral reaction from Catholicism, not an intellectual revival. The freedom desired affected not only the Protestant Churches, but all friends of liberty. He appealed to those who were indifferent to religion to secure for the Churches of this country the right to revise their creeds. Liberty was not a matter of compartments—freedom in Church life favoured democratic extension. But the State must effect this reform in the measured way, not by carelessly surrendering its control to the first indefinite appeal for revision.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said he had had some difficulty in following the argument of the hon. Member opposite. He had referred to this clause as being so abstruse that it could never be put into effective force. He thought that showed that the hon. Member opposite could not have studied the constitution of the Scotch Church, because what he had called an abstruse principle was but a well-known method adopted by the Scotch Church when it desired to take collective action.

MR. COMPTON RICKETT said that his complaint was not that it was abstruse, but that it was so simple that it would be unworkable.

MR. CRIPPS said this principle was at work every day, and had been at work for over 200 years, and it had been found not only to afford protection to the minority, but it had given fair weight to the views of the majority. He did not think it was possible to find a more effective system than that which had been worked out in the Church of Scotland. He wished to protest against introducing English difficulties and views on Church questions in a Scotch Bill. It ought to be realised that they were not dealing with one of those very bitter questions between Low Churchmen and Churchmen who held different views. They ought to put that entirely out of sight upon this occasion because it had nothing to do with the Scotch measure. The constitution of the Scotch Church was entirely different to the constitution of the English Church. The Scotch Church had liberty as regarded its Court for Church purposes, and this had always been denied to the Church of England. Surely English Members interested in the Church question ought not to seek under any guise to introduce into what had hitherto been a friendly feeling amongst all Presbyterian bodies those somewhat bitter troubles which, in his opinion, had done so much to endanger the true influence of religion in this country. He was somewhat astonished, the other day, to hear one of the hon. Members for Liverpool say that he could not imagine the idea of a National Church which had spiritual independence. There was no difficulty whatever in the Scotch Church in regard to this point. What was called the Disruption of the Free Church in the year 1843 took place on that very principle, which he thought was a very sound principle on all matters affecting Church government. In 1843 they disrupted because they thought they could have complete spiritual independence.

Considering this question purely as a Scotch matter, what was really being asked for? The hon. Member who had just sat down must feel that a Church to be effective in the best form ought to have a power of adaptation in its spiritual life to the growing opinions of the country from time to time. What objection was there to this particular section. He was not cognisant of Scotch opinion, but he had had many opportunities of gathering some forms of Scotch opinion, and he supposed that everyone interested in the religious question was very cognisant of Scotch religious history, which he thought was a great honour to Scotland, because no religious history went more deeply into truth and sincerity than the religious history of Scotland. He did not know whether hon. Members remembered the proposal of his right hon. and learned friend the Attorney-General upon this point, but it was thoroughly discussed and considered, and it was embodied in a measure which was known as Mr. Finlay's Bill. That measure was thoroughly, discussed and it had everyone's approval who was interested in the true religious life of Scotland. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] At any rate it had a very large measure of approval. It was quite absurd to suggest that this clause which had been introduced in the Bill and the principle upon which it was founded had not been thoroughly considered in the religious life of Scotland. He appealed to members of his own Church and to opponents as well in this House not to send their Church troubles where they were not felt. He hoped they would for once forget their own friction and let them now look into the truth and sincerity of a proposal of this kind. If they did that he thought they would be almost unanimous in supporting Clause 5 of this Bill. As far as he was concerned he did not seek to make a precedent out of something which was done under different conditions in the Scotch Church. He rather looked at the constitution of the Scotch Church and at its history in order to see what had been done in the past and to get to know what the religious feeling of the country desired. He hoped they would not introduce their own little religious bitternesses and difficulties, but, on the contrary, do all they could to introduce the true religious reform which was embodied in Section 5 of this Bill.

He understood that upon this particular Amendment they would be allowed to discuss a little more generally the principles of the Bill. In the first place he wished most heartily to congratulate the Lord-Advocate both upon his speech and upon the terms of this Bill. He wished to make one or two suggestions which perhaps the Government might see their way to carry out. If he thought that the Bill interfered with religious trusts or that it upset the decision of the House of Lords he would not be in favour of it. He agreed entirely with what had been said on that point. He agreed with almost every word of the admirable Report of the Commission to which this question was remitted. He would quote what the Report said in order that his opinion might be exactly understood. The words on page 17 of the Report were—

"The Legislature cannot reverse or nullify the final decision of the Law Courts without a violation of constitutional principle much more mischievous than any consequence, however harsh, which may follow from the legal decision in a particular case."

He entirely agreed with that.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): Do you agree that Parliament cannot upset a decision of the House of Lords?

MR. CRIPPS said Parliament could, of course, do anything. They could pass a Bill of Attainder. They could pass a Bill to cut the right hon. Gentleman's head off. He never said they had not the power to do it. He was talking of whether it was right in principle.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Does the right hon. Gentleman say that it is not right in principle for Parliament to take legislative action against the judgment of the Supreme Court.

MR. CRIPPS said he had quoted the words of the Commission itself. Of course, there might be cases where it would be absolutely essential for Parliament to interfere. Everyone could imagine that there were special instances in which Parliament might very properly and according to every principle of justice interfere with a decision. The question referred to the Commission was whether the Free Church of Scotland, in whose favour the decision was given, could adequately administer the trust funds which they would have to administer under the decision of the House of Lords. The answer given to that was a very important matter. On page 22 the Report said that where it appeared that the Free Church were unable adequately to execute the trusts the Commission—that was, the Commission to be created by this Bill—should be empowered to see that the property was administered in accordance with the trusts affecting it. Therefore, what the Commission reported was that the Free Church in whom the funds had been vested by the decision of the House of Lords was unable adequately to administer those trusts. In dealing with the surplus which the Free Church was unable to administer, of course in a case of this kind everyone would admit that the persons to administer the funds were the United Free Church. In the preamble of the Bill the question of religious trusts was made a very important matter. The words were—

> "Whereas questions have arisen as to property between the Free Church and the United Free Church in Scotland, and judgments have been given by the Courts in favour of the Free Church. And whereas a Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the matter have reported that the Free Church are unable adequately to carry out all the trusts of the property, and that it is desirable to provide for the allocation thereof, provision being made for the equipment of the Free Church——"

To his mind the principle laid down by the Royal Commission and the principle in the preamble of the Bill was the absolutely just and proper method of dealing with the undoubted difficulty which had arisen. It was to the honour of the Government that they appointed the Royal Commission and proposed this Bill. He had some heart-searchings when he first saw the Bill as to whether it adequately recognised the conditions brought about by the decision of the House of Lords. That was the question which he thought most people would ask themselves when they were considering whether the Bill was justly framed or not. It appeared to him that it did on the whole adequately recognise the position brought about by the decision of the House of Lords. If the Bill had gone the length of disregarding that altogether and merely bringing the funds into a hotchpotch and giving no powers to the Commission, then he thought it would have been wrong in principle. It would have come within the very evils pointed out by the Royal Commission and might have led to a bad precedent in future. It was obvious from what the Lord-Advocate said that in the provisions of the Bill itself he had recognised—he was not now going to say how far the recognition went—all the rights of the Free Church, having regard to the fact that in the litigation they had succeeded—whether rightly or not was a matter with which the House had nothing to do at the present moment. This was a matter of law, which had been decided once for all. It was upon these grounds, and realising the great necessity of dealing properly with a matter of this kind, that he should strongly support the proposal of the Government.

The Free Church was very desirous of effecting an arrangement with regard to the division of the property. He thought that was the right spirit in a matter of this kind. It ought to be made possible to settle by arrangement between the parties interested. He recognised that the only way outside of an arrangement between the parties themselves was the way suggested in the Bill. The fairest possible outside body must be got in order to settle the difficulty which, he thought, most people would have wished had been settled by the two parties themselves. With these reservations he hoped the Bill would go through without any introduction of what was threatened in regard to English sectarian questions in reference to Clause 5. If it did he thought a great act of justice would be done without any interference with what was the true principle in a case of this sort. He hoped the settlement might be final, and that these two great bodies, deeply permeated with the religious missionary spirit, deeply permeated with an earnest desire to carry out religious life in Scotland, would forget any friction which had arisen, concentrate their attention on what was their true vocation, and do what they could to encourage and keep alive the religious spirit of Scotland with as little animosity as they could.

***MR. THOMAS SHAW** (Hawick Burghs) said the speech to which they had just listened was interesting in two particulars. For a full half of it, it bore on the Bill only in respect of one clause; and as that clause appeared to have been an entirely unnecessary introduction of foreign matter alongside of the substantial remedy which was to be effected by the measure, he could only say that that speech was one of the many illustrations in the course of this debate, how, from the Parliamentary point of view, the Government had done the very best thing to complicate, to protract, and to harass the discussion of what would otherwise have been very simple. His hon. friend the Member for Shropshire had taken a true view of the Barrier Act. His hon. friend the Member for Scarborough did not seem to be aware that for a couple of hundred years they had transacted their Presbyterian Government by the aid of the caution and the efficiency secured by the Barrier Act—a most excellent method under Presbyterian form of obtaining general and local agreement as to what should be the method of government for the Church. But, on the other hand, the reference to the Barrier Act seemed to him entirely to condemn Clause 5. That clause was radically to effect a change in the sense of empowering the Church to alter its creed, but the Barrier Act, which was specifically made for the purpose of consulting the entire body of Church opinion in Scotland, and which would have secured the precautions and efficiency alluded to, was never put into effect before this Bill was Tabled in the House of Commons. In short, it was one of the most remarkable feats of Parliamentary dexterity that he remembered, that the Assembly passed a Resolution requesting a certain most important constitutional change to be made, and, within a week of this complaint, the Government embodied it in a Bill without the Church of Scotland through its organised machinery being consulted at all.

His hon. friend said there had been great peace in Scotland—peace in the development of ecclesiastical and theological progress. How had it been achieved? It had been achieved in the only sound method of achieving freedom in the evolution of theological opinion, viz., by throwing off the trammels of State support and control. The noblest chapters in the history of Scotland were those which were allied with religious dissent from organised authority attempted to be imposed upon Church Courts and the freedom and self-government which they should represent. These chapters had had an influence on the history of England, and had gone largely to make up the strong foundation of that British liberty which they enjoyed to-day. But all that had not been done under the cover of Royal authority or of Established religion. It had been done apart from it, and very often in defiance of it. If they had achieved peace in Scotland to-day in religious matters it was because they had bought it with a price. Therefore, for those within the Establishment who now not unnaturally looked to this juncture of affairs as one which might be used with profit to their interests, they should have perforce in consequence of observations on these debates to be pointed to what he and his friends thought a worthier and better remedy, namely, that Presbyterian union, ecclesiastical peace, and ecclesiastical freedom were more likely to be achieved not within but outside the trammels of the Establishment.

With regard to the observations in connection with Clause 5, the House would observe that so extremely dilatory were the tactics of the Government that it was almost impossible for any speech to be delivered without being largely occupied with substantially a Committee point. So introduced it was apt to confuse and harass the action of Members of Parliament who dealt with it as a matter of principle. He ventured to cross swords with his hon. and learned friend opposite who had dealt on a legal point which he had raised. He did not assent for one instant to the two lines cited from the Report of the Royal Commission. There was nothing *de jure* unconstitutional in a British Parliament reversing the decision of a judicial tribunal, however lofty. The whole question could be summed up in the old brocard which he employed, viz., *Summum jus, summa injuria.* To those who, like himself, had followed with deep and sympathetic interest the whole of those proceedings since the decision of the House of Lords on August 1st of last year, he should say that there never was a case more clearly made out of *Summa injuria* on a colossal, a national, and a religious scale. And if he had not been able to devise another method of getting all the remedy really demanded, while paying formal deference to the judgment of the House to Lords—if he had not been able to excogitate that system for himself he should have had no hesitation whatever in taking the field as an advocate of the repeal of the judgment of the House of Lords. That was a strong thing for anyone in his position to say; but he thought it was constitutionally defended by the maxim that you could not allow any permanent disturbance of social order and social peace to be effected on merely technical grounds, and apart from an inquiry into facts. But having said that with regard to his hon. and learned friend's argument, he rejoiced to learn from him—and he learned it with a shock of surprise—that the Free Church of Scotland was ready and willing to make an arrangement. That was a most admirable frame of mind; but he wished they had heard of it a little earlier.

In the course of this discussion the hon. member for Dumbartonshire seemed to throw on the Table of the House something in the nature of a sealed tender from the Free Church of Scotland, and they were asked to put in a counter sealed tender. This was the situation they had now reached—that the body which, from the beginning to this very day, had insisted on the last ounce and pound of its legal rights, was now confronted with the manifest intention of Parliament not to permit this great wrong to be continued, and was now in a position to say that it was willing to make an arrangement. Well, it was not too late; but they must have their Commission. And before the Commission the Free Church might then renew the operations which were hoped for in a former case, and which Lord Elgin and his colleagues alluded to when they said that all prospects of peace were very soon clouded when the Free Church witnesses entered the witness-box. The general situation touched by the Bill was very strange. In the midst of a law-abiding people at least one-third of the entire population of Scotland—represented in the United Free Church, a Church of unbounded, almost fabulous, Christian liberality—had been stripped entirely of its property. They had in that Church many men and women still alive who cherished the memories of the Disruption. But the Disruption was greatly different from the present case, because in the Disruption they were dissevered from the provision made for them and their families by the State; whereas now, under the decision of the House of Lords, they had been stripped of and dissevered from the very work and contributions of their own hands. The Scotch Judges took the sensible view of the situation which had been universally approved, apart from technical rule, by the judgment of the people at large—yet they were to-day discussing a Bill the urgency for which could not be concealed, for men were being dispossessed of their churches, their homes, and their dearest associations, and this was all done in respect of an appeal to the judgment of the House of Lords!

Certain misapprehensions existed as to the action of the United Free Church after the decision in Scotland, and before its reversal by the Lords. The Press of the country had been on the whole extremely just on this matter. He regretted for one that newspapers like *The Times* had, no doubt entirely unintentionally, been misled with regard to what they considered was some initial harshness on the part of the United Free Church. Let him state what was the position? Each minister of the Free Church who did not enter the Union was left in undisturbed possession of his manse. The congregations of each and all of those ministers were left in undisturbed possession of their churches. The congregations which did not wish to enter the Union were left in undisturbed possession of their church property: and no retired minister or evangelical agent of the Church who held office under the old *regime*, but who did not desire to enter the Union — not one of these men was deprived of his office or retiring allowance. Therefore, there was justice in every aspect of this treatment of the small minority by the United Free Church of Scotland. He could not understand how a delusion to an opposite effect, propagated from a quarter with regard to which he had his views, could have taken root so far, and spread even to *The Times*.

As to the decision itself which they were now remedying, for, after all, it was a reversal which was needed, he might say that there were many false and ignorant expectations of what would be done when the House of Lords pronounced its judgment on August 1st. These expectations—false and ignorant as they were—did not arise so much in English as in what he would call Anglified minds—those superior persons who, being in Scotland, had imbibed Prelatic notions and extraordinary ideas as to the majesty of the law and how people should crouch before it. That kind of mind was shocked at the idea that the Scottish people should stand up against this judgment of the House of Lords. In the first place, they said, "Go back on the Union and wipe it out." He had been connected with the Union movement ever since its inception. A finer movement never existed; less sordid in its motives, prompted more by commanding liberal views; and no more enlightened appreciation of that Union was ever delivered than by the Prime Minister himself on its consummation. The Prime Minister, however, spoke before the Lord Chancellor spoke. Therefore, when it was said that they ought to go back on the Union and undo it, all he could say was that those who urged that plea little knew either the trend or fibre of the Scottish character. When, again, it was said, "Now that the decision has been given and it is indicated in the Lords decision that you have not the spiritual independence which you claimed, you had better sacrifice spiritual independence for the sake of the properties,"—little did persons who said that know of Scottish history. They in Scotland had in the past been able fearlessly to scrutinise all the *dicta* of authority, and when they found any device under which it would be made easy for them to get property if only they conformed to the law, they had a very strong suspicion of the policy of what such conformity might mean. In the mind of a Scotsman who had been born and bred in the traditions of his country, he had to see, in the first place, before he would conform to the law, whether the law conformed to those rights of a free people and to those moral equities without which the law was rather akin to brute force than to the reasoned expression of a people's will. History over and over again in Scotland had put authority, legal or Royal, in its proper place; and the people who were accustomed to stand erect before the head that wore a crown were not likely to crouch before the head that wore a wig.

But in the next place, how false and ignorant were those expectations, when it was supposed that they who belonged to the United Free Church were about to allow the sacred work itself to suffer and the sacred trust itself to go derelict in the hands of those who were unable to administer it. He quite admitted, from his own point of view, that he had cut before the point in this matter. He was so well apprised as to how matters stood, that from his first deliverance made on the subject on September 17th he went straight and clear for an Executive Commission. After all, if they were to reach firm ground on this matter, the House must go back to the time when there was no prospect of or temptation in respect of property on either hand; that was to say to 1900, in order to see the true relative proportions and powers of the parties. The result of the decision was that property of 300,000 people was to be given to be administered by 4,000; that 1,159 ministers were to be stripped of all their ecclesiastical possessions, and that all their duties were to be performed by twenty-seven ministers; and that 1,104 congregations were to surrender to twenty-six. Such a situation outraged the sense of justice, interfered with the prospects of ordinary Christian duty, and imperilled social peace. This kind of legality was very provocative of disrespect for the law and of lawlessness; and it was only because the people were strong in the belief that this House would act justly that they had borne the ordeal with such dignity and patience. It was for that reason that he regretted the delay in the introduction of the Bill. The general property affected amounted, roughly, to £2,000,000; the congregational property affected amounted to £6,000,000. It was truly because the magic word "trust" ignored the distinction between the dead hand and the living organism that the present situation had arisen.

The decision of the House of Lords might be good law—of that they had their own opinion—but it put Scotchmen in a hard case. The work would have to be carried on; and, therefore, he would revert to the situation before the Union. It was carried on then, not by accumulated funds, but by annual contributions—the work not of the dead hand but of the living organism to which he had referred—the living Church. Out of £170,158 for home work, the Free Church—the successful litigant—only contributed £947. Thus far as to work at home. Then as regarded work abroad, missions had been supported with the approval and admiration of all Christian men, and the United Free Church contributed £75,000 as against £320 by the other. It was from this point of view that the decision of the House of Lords should be regarded. For every £ required—absolutely required for home work—the successful litigants contributed only 4d., and for every £ required for foreign work the successful party only contributed 3d. The result was the serious prospect of a great dereliction of the trust accompanied by personal sufferings, religious loss, and sheer illegality. He rejoiced at the statement of the Prime Minister that the numerous litigations begun since the judgment of the House of Lords would not affect the judgment of the House of Commons in connection with this Bill. Yet, notwithstanding, what the Prime Minister and the Royal Commission said, the Free Church went on with litigation after litigation and had interdicted over a 100 congregations.

He had suggested that there should be an Executive Commission right away. The Government not unnaturally hesitated: they required to be convinced as to the necessity; they instituted inquiry; the Royal Commission was appointed; and its Report confirmed entirely his original view. The Royal Commission stated—

> "It is not, we think, inconsistent with respect for the decision to say that while the legal title of the Free Church has been placed beyond question, it is still to be noted that for practical purposes it is only an inconsiderable minority of the original and undivided Free Church, apart from the single divergence from the original constitution which has deprived it of its claim to be identified with the Church of the Disruption, it does still, for all practical purposes, answer the description of the institution which the endowments obtained on Dr. Chalmer's circular were intended to maintain."

Then as to whether the Free Church could adequately execute the trust, the Commissioners stated—

> "It appears to us that if they were to undertake to administer them according to their terms they must almost certainly fail."

Parliament was, therefore, apprised of the fact that unless measures were taken, there must be a dereliction of trust. The Commissioners were anxious to give effect to the views of the hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division; but they could not. They stated—

> "But there is no evidence that anything of the kind is even probable. At the utmost it may gain a few congregations or even a few thousands of additional adherents at the expense of a deplorable amount of animosity and bad feeling."

Therefore, from the date of that Report the way was as clear as day if the Government wished to be loyal to the Commission and not to mix the matter up with anything else. But the Free Church, intoxicated with the view taken by the House of Lords of their legal rights, had done many strong things. They hurried on their interdicts, obtaining over fifty of them after they saw that the Royal Commission was likely to decide or had decided against them. They worked on the principle of the penny-in-the-slot. They put in the House of Lords' judgment and pulled out a church. A splendid idea from the Scottish point of view, because they had all the advantage of the penny-in the-slot arrangement, without even contributing the penny. Throughout all this there was one man who held a firm and just view. That was Lord Dunedin. His conduct was beyond all praise. He had heard both sides before appointing the Commission; then he acted with firmness, promptitude and decision. And as regarded the Commissioners they had every reason to be satisfied with the fulness and accuracy of the inquiry. He regretted that they had not been given a freer hand. That would have given more simplicity with reference to the framing of the Bill; and greater elasticity, freedom, and justice in working out the scheme. As to the pooling of funds he had heard the speech which the Lord Advocate addressed to the House with a great feeling of relief. The Free Church agreed to the original proposal of this Bill because they could put their hands into the general pocket and scoop out anything they desired for undefined purposes. The Commission said—

> "It is manifest that they can make no proper use of churches and manses in districts where they have few or no adherents, and to turn real property appropriated to special purposes into money which might be applied to the general purposes of their Church would, in our opinion, amount to a breach of trust."

Would the House believe it? That was the very breach of trust which this Bill in its original shape was going to sanction! He was glad to know that the pooling scheme had been abandoned. Still he should like to have the exact alteration which the Government proposed; and he would suggest the committal of the Bill *pro forma* in order that they might have an opportunity of seeing the changes in type.

The Bill spoke of "adequate" provision for the Free Churches. What did that mean? Adequate provision had meant in the past a provision, the main portion of which consisted of annual free-will offerings on the part of the people themselves. But this Bill abandoned, or appeared to abandon that; it was merely a scheme for the creation of perpetual endowments, and that was a system which even the successful litigants could scarcely have the confidence to claim because it was a system which was inconsistent with their best traditions. To all appearance this was a body which would have little living force or progress in the country, and he did not say this in any hostile sense because they were entitled to their belief, but they really appeared to be little hope of that Church ever growing into a great progressive body in Scotland. They were perpetuating a cause with little real vitality, and in religious matters the worst policy that could be adopted was to give permanence to the external body regardless of the vital spirit within. All over Scotland would be seen the spectacle of "Tulchan" churches, imitation calves stuffed with hay which were put down in front of the cows in order to help to extract milk from the cow. If separate endowments were to be set up, where were they to come from? Out of the offering of the members of the Free Church community as capitalised. And these bodies were to be set up, and were to be lodged in buildings given to them for nothing, and were to be supported by endowments to which they had not contributed a farthing. They would have just enough appearance of establishment as to enable them to extract the milk from that good cow the United Free Church. It was very necessary, therefore, to get at the mind of the Government and see what they meant by adequate provision.

With regard to the congregational arrangements he did not think the Government fully realised that they had in their hands material for settling the arrangements for the ownership of the churches in the model trust deed of the Free Church itself. That deed was most ably drawn, and had stood the tests of sixty years, and was ingenious, simple, and perfectly equitable. It was sufficient to remember that the Free Church had in view the fact that a question might arise as to which was the true Free Church, and in such event it settled what the arrangement was to be. This was the language of the Act of Assembly in 1844—

> "That the congregational property which is ordinarily to be regulated by the majority of the Assembly should, in the event of a split in the Church, be determined by a majority of the congregation, whatever the Courts of law may determine as to which of the contending parties is to be held to be the Free Church."

The congregation in each case was to be allowed to determine that matter for itself and to determine it by a majority. They had, he thought, with regard to this matter, better go back to the old practice of the majority ruling, and that all these proposals as to thirds and fourths should disappear forever. That something of this kind had been expected was perfectly clear from what had happened in the history of the Free Church. And Lord Davey, who delivered judgment in the House of Lords, made utterances in the same sense. In a letter published in *The Times* on the 26th September Lord Davey said—

> "If I had been asked (which I was not) I should have suggested that each congregation should retain its property and be at liberty, by vote of the members, to join either one party or the other."

But what had been going on? Take one or two instances, say the case of Campbelltown. The property was worth £10,000, there was an endowment of £1,180, a membership of 700, and there was an adherence of 430. There were nearly 2,000 souls attached to that congregation. On the 30th of August last, at the end of the month in which the House of Lords judgment was pronounced, the Campbelltown congregation met and decided formally that they would adhere to the Union, but on the 17th September the following advertisement appeared in the *Argyllshire Herald*, a paper published in Campbelltown—

> "All friends in Campbeltown and neighbourhood who adhere to the whole doctrine, worship, and discipline of the Free Church at the Disruption will please send me without delay their names and addresses, with a view to forming a congregation in connection with the said church."

He remembered the Attorney-General for Ireland telling the House a story about an artist who said that the subject of his picture was "Adam before he was created." Here was a Free church which was not created until the 16th of September, and the House would scarcely credit it, but that church so formed was, as the result of law proceedings, in the possession of the whole of the property, and nearly 2,000 souls had been evicted, only forty of the former members being in the property now. Let men go back to 1900, because membership since then was possibly tempted by property. When they went back to 1900 they got rid of this scandal and got upon firm ground, but when they got back to 1900 they should not do a bad thing, they should not give to one quarter of a church that which ought to belong to the whole, when the three-quarters who were to go out were to get no compensation of any kind or description. It was clear to those who knew the facts that when once the quarter which was left was installed in these hugh properties they would crush them to the ground, whilst the majority of the people were abandoned to find places of religious worship for themselves. The entire community were indignant at the idea, because they knew that these large and suitable properties, now that the majority had been excluded, would by-and-by fall into decay.

What happened in the case of Dumbarton only the other day while this Bill was being discussed? In that case 924 members and 300 adherents were excluded from the magnificent building, which had been largely added to since the Union. Fourteen members only remained, and those fourteen members got all the property, on which £3,500 had been spent since the Union. All this was very much akin to legalised piracy. With regard to the difference between the one-third and the one-fourth, there were some serious cases he would like the Government to consider. The minister of Rogart wrote—

> "We rebuilt the church and added a new hall. The work was begun in June, 1899, and finished in 1902 (two years after the Union). I, personally, gathered between £1,300 and £1,400. Under £40 represents the contributions of the legal Free Church. The whole cost £1,700, and I got £550 since the Union. . . . To hand over the whole under the third rule would be a cruel wrong to our own people."

He, therefore, again put forward the plea that the majority should be preferred. There were places, such as Strathaird in Skye and Knock in the Island of Lewis, where the congregations were excluded from the churches, many of which were standing empty, and the people had to worship on the hillside or in caves by the seashore in circumstances of gross and cruel hardship. If any consideration were had to the equities of the case, note must be taken of the sources from which the money and property had been derived. Ninety-nine per cent. of the property had been contributed by those who were now attached to the Union. He hoped he had said enough to show that the Bill in these cardinal points must be amended, and amended in so specific a way that the House of Commons was entitled to see exactly where it stood.

He was disinclined to enter upon the fifth Clause. It was a great pity that it had been introduced into the Bill as it had nothing whatever to do with any of the wrongs he had been describing. The Lord-Advocate had said that the Act of 1693 was passed by a strange Parliament. Yes, and it had taken two centuries to get such another strange Parliament to do what was now proposed. Without a Barrier Act and without the people of Scotland being consulted, this clause was inserted into a Bill which had nothing to do with the subject. Out of the Dissenters' extremity the Church of Scotland was finding what one of its ministers unctuously called a providential opportunity. English Nonconformists were entirely mistaken if they thought that Scottish Nonconformists, who knew what it was to go out and suffer and to pay their own way, were deserting them in this instance. Their feeling was that the Bill was worthy of a Second Reading, but that this clause should not be passed by the House of Commons. It was proposed by this Bill to take away the personal and individual test which the Act of 1693 set up. But the Act of 1690 still contained the confession of the Church of Scotland, embodied in an Act of Parliament; it was to be the "public and avowed Confession" of the Church of Scotland. It was too mysterious, too casuistical, for him to understand how, if a document was the public and avowed Confession of the Church, a person was allowed to sign under a signature which meant that he privately disavowed that Confession. It was the Church's public and avowed belief, but the ministers' private and disavowed belief. He did not pretend to know how that could be squared, or how it was possible to make a signature of that kind without more troubles of conscience than existed under the present system.

The Lord-Advocate had raised the question of whether they believed that Parliament should regulate, tighten, or slacken that bond. Personally he was reluctant to enter upon such topics, but, since the challenge had been made, he must speak his mind. He held that Parliament had nothing whatever to do with this question. He did not think it was the duty of the State to go beyond the relations between man and man. All his thinking life he had held that the work of civil polity was quite enough for the State, and that it was a presumptuous act on the part of any Parliament to attempt to regulate the relations of man with the Unseen. That general principle was confirmed by the experience of Scotland where freedom from State alliance had produced in religious matters a vitality and liberality such as the world had seldom seen, and a learning and erudition of acknowledged excellence all over the English-speaking world. The living contact of the people with the responsibilities of self-support and religious freedom from State control had done no injury whatever to religion, but, on the contrary, had been its bulwark. The freedom here sought could never be conferred by the State. It was no right of the State to confer upon any Church its freedom, and that freedom could never be obtained except by separation from the State, even at the cost of defiance of the State. All Scotch history confirmed the view that wherever religion was vital and sincere it could pay its own way. He therefore deplored the unctuous references to the "providential interposition" and the "providential juncture" which enabled the State at this time of day to attempt to slacken the bond. If the people wanted freedom let them dare to be free by coming out. He would put the matter from a Parliamentary point of view in such a way as would, he thought, convince every man in the House. If this clause had had to be a Bill, as it might well have been, it would never have seen the light. No Government would ever have brought it in—amongst other reasons because the Church of Scotland itself had made no uncertain pronouncement on the subject. The matter had been discussed in the Assembly of the Church of Scotland. One of the most distinguished leaders of that Assembly, Principal Story, said in 1902—

> "Whether in the present condition of the British Parliament it was hopeful to approach it with a proposal in favour of such a change in the formula as they would desire was a very doubtful question."

Dr. Marshall, also a well-known leader, said—

> "Had a case been made out of such urgency that they should, at this time, enter upon the matter which, if it was entered upon, would bring with it momentous issues, it would lead to long and bitter controversy."

Why had that long and bitter controversy, foreseen by the Established Church itself, been dovetailed into this measure for the relief of a great trust and a patrimonial wrong? Then Dr. Scott spoke his mind very plainly, saying—

> "He could not conceive it probable in the state of political opinion now, and for years to come, to go to Parliament to get rid of this formula. Their own people would rise against them——"

There had been nothing in the way of consultation with the Church of Scotland on the matter, and on the testimony of Dr. Scott their own people would rise against them. Dr. Scott continued—

> "Certainly the Dissenters of Scotland would rise against them; the Nonconformists of England would oppose them; and even those members of the Cabinet who were favourable would oppose them; because they had to depend as a Unionist Government on the votes of Nonconformists. They would tell them, 'You wish to get rid of the statute; well, let us drop the connection between Church and State.'"

Then Dr. Mair, a distinguished man of blunt expression, said—

> "He did not want to go into Parliament to make a fool of himself. The present Parliament would not handle such a question."

This was only two years ago, and yet within a week of the Established Church passing the proposal it was embodied by the Government in a clause of this Bill! Dr. Scott also said—

> "If they went to the State to get a modification of the Confession of Faith or their relation to it, they would be opposed by their own people; they would be opposed by the whole Dissenters of Scotland; they would be opposed by their very friends in the Government; there could not be a more insane proposal than to go to the State and ask that modification."

It was this "insane proposal" which was embodied in Clause 5. He altogether objected to the political surrender by the State of its powers. Reference had been made to the Act of 1865 with regard to the clerical subscription in England. The Act of 1865 was clearly in favour of quite a different course, and it allowed the State to see upon the face of the Statute-book how things stood, and in three different sections that was specifically provided for.

While they sympathised with the objections raised to Clause 5, the House might take it from him that they were extremely anxious that there should be no division of opinion with regard to the Second Reading of this Bill. He perfectly well understood the position of his hon. friend the Member for Morley Division who had moved this Amendment, and he largely shared his views, but speaking from a Parliamentary point of view he thought this Bill ought to go through its Second Reading, leaving them all a free hand when this objectionable clause was reached. This Bill had been too long delayed, and although cramped and restricted it would remove an intolerable wrong. In this long trial Scotland had stood well. Her sufferings in the past for religion's sake had ennobled her character and had taught her to put authority at no more than its proper value. Even should this Bill fail to pass, even that would not shake the tenacity of the Scottish character. But with proper despatch and concessions of Amendments such as he had asked for, this Bill would not fail. It was not a constructive Bill in the ordinary sense. There should be no mistake. This Bill truly reformed, truly inaugurated, nothing, but it was perhaps none the less valuable because it proposed to undo a great wrong which, whatever might be its legal aspect, was a wrong morally undeserved, and a wrong on a national scale which Parliament would do well at once to remedy.

MR. ELLIOT (Durham) said it occurred to him that the hon. and learned Gentleman had been dealing at great length with a state of things which a decision of the House of Lords had brought about, and he had pointed out that it was necessary to take some step if they were not going to face greater wrongs, possibly leading to the disturbance of peace. He imagined that the hon. and learned Gentleman was speaking rather as the representative of one of the interested parties. He wished to say a few words upon the main principle of the Bill. They were now legislating to redress the effects of a judgment of the House of Lords. They might call it reversing that judgment or reversing the state of things which existed between two litigants upon which the House of Lords had given a decision. That was a very serious step for Parliament to take, because it meant practically that they were enacting by State authority that property which had been declared by the highest Court of Appeal in litigation to be the property of A should now become the property of B. He could not imagine a much higher action of a State authority than that. He thought, however, that State action was justified by the present condition of ecclesiastial affairs in Scotland. They had heard some remarks about the House of Lords with which he could not agree. The function of Courts of law was to decide as to the rights of property between individuals, and they had to look to the principle which they laid down. Courts of law had not merely to look at a particular case which they had in hand, but they had to consider that if they laid down a principle in a particular case it might be extended to other particular cases. Hon. Members of this House, and still more persons outside, had criticised the Courts of law as if it was the duty of those Courts to decide who could make the best use of certain property and who was best fitted to use it in the most advantageous way to the State. As Lord Robertson said with great point it was the function of a Court of law to see that property went to those to whom it belonged, and not to those whom it might best happen to fit. The State had now been called in to remedy a state of things which would produce disaster and trouble, and would probably lead to a disturbance of the peace in considerable portions of the United Kingdom if some remedy was not found. The reason for the interference of the State through Parliament had been proved by all the evidence of the case, and he would deal with it from that point of view. The Free Church might have some grievances, but the United Church evidently had been most harshly treated, and in a manner which it was quite impossible for them to allow to proceed.

With regard to Clause 5, which really was the only important matter, he should be extremely surprised if any considerable portion of the Liberal Party went into the lobby to maintain a closer restriction in regard to religious tests, and he felt sure they would do their best to lighten the burden of those tests, and stand on the side of maintaining liberty of conscience. It had not been denied that this formula would serve to exclude from the Church of Scotland those who might very likely become the most respected and admired of the ministers of the future. He could not conceive a Liberal who boasted of Liberal principles coming forward and doing his best to maintain the rigidity of the tests, which would keep out broad-minded men whose only fault was that they were in unison with the sentiments of their own age rather than with the sentiments of their ancestors who lived 200 years ago. He was quite aware that it might be held by that removing this burden from the Established Church of Scotland they were to some extent trenching on the rigidity of the established system. As had been pointed out by his hon. and learned friend the Member for Stretford, there had always been the greatest distinction between State Establishment as understood in England and State Establishment as understood in Scotland, because the latter was recognised as involving a very considerable amount of legislative power. They had legislative power within limits and they were limited by Acts of Parliament. To declare, however, that they would not allow any relaxation of tests was to his mind asking the House of Commons to take up a more retrograde position than Parliament had taken up for the last thirty years. Let those who wanted greater liberty for their churches get it step by step and not take up the position that they would have no more liberty because they could not free themselves absolutely and entirely from the State.

All those views about the connection between Church and State and Church endowments were from year to year undergoing very considerable change. They were undergoing a change in this direction. There was an idea that as time went on the Established Church and the voluntary Churches were insensibly becoming more like each other in regard to property. There was a time when the property of the Church of Scotland was common to the State, and when the great bulk of the wealth came from the State. That state of things had long passed. It was certainly the case that far less than half of its wealth was derived from the State. All the rest of its wealth came from the sources which furnished the great endowments of the Free Church before the union with the United Presbyterian Church. In respect of property the two Churches were constantly assimilating. He ventured to say also that the two systems were assimilating from the constitutional point of view, because there was more and more a tendency, rightly or wrongly, to give to Established Churches much greater liberty of self-government, almost approaching the self-government given in voluntary Churches. In both these respects the Churches were rapidly assimilating the condition of things which lay at the basis of voluntaryism and Establishment. They ought to be a little on their guard as to giving liberty to a Church. Giving liberty to a Church when worked out generally meant giving liberty to a Church council or assembly. That might be a very different thing from giving liberty to the members of the Church. He ventured to say that there were Churches in existence in respect of which the interference of the State by the strong hand of the law, and the position which the State held in regard to the law, were a great security for liberty within those Churches. As to the main question dealt with in the Bill, he hoped they were all at one in desiring a remedy for the terrible state of things brought about by the House of Lords' decision. He hoped also that when the House came to divide on Clause 5 there would be no considerable majority of the Liberal Party who would go into the lobby to support the rigidity of tests.

MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said the Bill when amended in Committee, as they hoped it would be, gave the prospect of the settlement of the difficult and distressing question which had agitated Scotland during the past year. It was a matter of practical urgency that this difficulty should be brought to a conclusion soon. In Scotland there was not only a sense of hardship and inconvenience in connection with this question, but this condition of things was aggravated by the strong consciousness of practical injustice in the working of the Church system at present. That was a state of matters which they could not remedy too early. He did not speak of the danger of breaches of social order, but he said it was a very bad thing for religion to have the state of feeling which they had in Scotland at the present moment. It was because he believed this matter to be so urgent that he deprecated the introduction into the Bill of Clause 5 dealing with the formula of the Church of Scotland. He thought it would have been better if this Bill had dealt only with the simple question of restoring a proper state of matters in respect of the judgment of the House of Lords. The responsibility for the course which had been taken rested with the Government. It was a very grave responsibility. They would find it very difficult indeed to answer to the people of Scotland if they pursued an end other than that immediately concerned, however good that end might be, and thereby imperilled the passing of a Bill which was so urgently demanded by the condition of the Free Churches. The Government must be aware of that responsibility. They must take it as entirely of their own doing if difficulty arose in connection with this matter, and they must take it as entirely of their own doing if they protracted the state of hardship and bitterness which was working so much havoc in the religious life of Scotland just now.

Since this question had been raised they must deal with it on its merits. He perfectly understood the apprehension on the part of his hon. friends which led them to oppose Clause 5 dealing with the Established Church of Scotland. He would appeal to them not to do anything to aggravate the danger which might exist of losing so important a Bill. They had made, and were making, a fair protest on a matter of principle. Nobody could dispute their absolute right to do so, but he sincerely hoped that they would allow this most essential piece of legislation to proceed without any undue delay. He wished them to appreciate the urgency of the matter, and also the great distinction there was, as the hon. Member for Stretford had pointed out, between the ecclesiastical system of Scotland and that of England. He could not help thinking that their apprehensions would be removed if they realised the extent to which the State Church in Scotland was a self-governing and democratic Church. It was not a Church governed clerically. It was a Church governed by the people constituting it. Surely it was an entirely different proposition to give liberty to the people of a Church to decide their own affairs from giving liberty to a certain number of clergymen to decide those affairs for them.

He would explain in a few words why on the merits of this case he was in favour of the general policy of the proposal in the Bill without committing himself to any of the details. He supported Clause 5 because it embodied the traditional claim of the Scottish Church to be free to regulate its own spiritual affairs. That was a claim which had been made up to the time of what was called the Disruption in 1843. It was made not only by those who afterwards became the Free Church of Scotland, but by the whole of the Church of Scotland, although they did not all take the same course when their claim was denied. If this House chose to admit sixty years afterwards what most of them in Scotland thought ought to have been admitted long ago, he did not see why those who had always held that it was a just claim should deny it now. He did not deny that it was a claim inconsistent with the bond between Church and State. It was inconsistent with that. He did not think it was a position in which they could permanently rest that a Church was to be specially recognised by the State and yet remain free to regulate all its own affairs. He thought the error lay not in the claim of freedom of doctrine but in the bond which brought that freedom into question at the hands of the State. He regarded this clause as in reality a step away from State connection—a loosening of the bond which existed between Church and State in Scotland. Whether that was so or not, he would ask those who wished to bring about a dissolution of the bond between Church and State by making the bond more galling to reconsider so dangerous and serious a view. He did not think they should seek disestablishment by that which would cause injury to religion.

After all, these questions of government were questions of machinery—questions of ways and means to an end. But they ought not to injure or retard the religious life of the country merely in order to prove that their own theory of the proper relation between Church and State was the best. Do not let them sacrifice in any degree the end to the means, and do not let them destroy the result simply in order that they might make the machinery theoretically more perfect. For his part he believed that the case for the absolute equality of all religions was unanswerably strong. Do not let them travesty it by trying to bind Churches by law in the name, above all things, of a religious freedom. Let them go past forms, past theoretical constructions, and consider the reality that was behind the desire to have a formula making the relation of the individual to the Confession more visible. Surely they ought to do everything they could to simplify the situation for a man entering on the ministry. They should ask themselves, if they thought of opposing Clause 5, whether it was necessary for them—and unless it was necessary they should not do it—to say that every man entering the Church should be able to conform to what was required in the seventeenth century, or whether it was not enough that he should be able as an honest man to satisfy the Church which he sought to serve that he was substantially at one with it in faith and purpose.

There was another aspect of this question which was of very real importance, namely, that while the Church of Scotland derived certain material advantages from the State, these, as the hon. Member for Durham had pointed out, were not its only resources. As a matter of fact, the Church of Scotland had very large property which was derived from exactly those sources from which the property of the Free Church came. It had property in the shape of £4,500,000 worth of endowments which had been contributed voluntarily to the Church. They ought to remember that in view of the decision of the House of Lords—on which he did not wish to express any opinion—the whole position of this property was imperilled. Supposing that the Church of Scotland were to desire to enter into a union with another Church which did not take exactly the view which the Confession of Faith took. As things stood, without Clause 5 in the Bill, it would be open to any minority of that Church to take possession not merely of all those resources which that Church derived from its connection with the State, but of all the resources provided by private persons to forward the interests of religion in Scotland within that Church. When that danger had been revealed for the first time by the decision of the House of Lords, surely it was not unreasonable that they should wish to protect the Church of Scotland against that which all recognised to have been inequitable and intolerable in the case of the United Free Church. What was unjust in the one case, should not be allowed to take place in the other. He desired to see greater freedom of conscience, greater power of development, and greater security for the trusts committed to them in the case of all the Scotch Churches; and on these grounds he felt bound to give his support to Clause 5 at every stage.

But there were other matters which he wished the Government to take seriously into consideration. He was quite sure that the Government quite realised that they must make this Bill a reasonable and permanent settlement. They welcomed the changes which had been foreshadowed in the speech of the Lord-Advocate, for the maintenance of the purposes of the trusts, and the inclusion within the Bill of all the property which could possibly be dealt with in the future; and, above all, the assurance that the *bona fides* of members and adherents of the Free Church should be strictly regarded by the Commission to be appointed. He sincerely regretted the change which the been suggested as to the number of persons in the Free Church who were to be allowed to claim to be a congregation. It was a large enough order to allow one-third of the old congregation to claim the property without respect to the rights of the remaining two-thirds; but when the proportion was reduced to one-fourth a step was taken which made it very difficult for the majority of any such congregation in any degree to acquiesce in. The Lord-Advocate had been engaged lately in trying to arrange a compromise, and he did not for a moment wish to blame the hon. and learned Gentleman, but the time had come when the question of compromise must be left on one side and when they must really make a respected and enduring settlement. By all means let provision be made for all the personal rights and interests of those who took great risks when they entered into the action which they had gained. They should receive full consideration at the hands of the Government; but, in regard to property, the facts and the substance of the case must also be considered. He did not for one moment wish to speak in a partisan spirit, but the public, moral, and religious interests of Scotland ought not to be sacrificed to any temporary convenience or bargain. From the point of view of the United Free Church he thought it would be a very serious calamity for the whole Presbyterian Church in Scotland if the United Free Church were to be impoverished; but it would be a far greater calamity if the Free Church were unduly and unnecessarily enriched. That would be a positive evil and danger to the religious life of Scotland, because after a time, he believed, the Free Church would grow weaker, and in many districts, especially in the Highlands, there would be nothing left of it except its endowments. They might call it the Free Church to the crack of doom, but it was not to be compared to a National Church and it was not willing to be free. It ought not to be treated as a large and growing factor in the religious life of Scotland. All this doctrine about its being the nucleus of a great Church was fraught with disaster to Scottish religious life; and he begged the Government to face the facts of the situation and endow the Royal Commission with full powers to make an enduring settlement.

Mr. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) said that the subject of this Bill was of deep interest to the whole of the English Nonconformists, and one portion of it would certainly receive their strongest opposition. They were engaged at the present moment in taking away, by the paramount force of Parliament, property from a small ecclesiastical section of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland which had been declared by the Courts of law to be the rightful owners thereof, and transferring it to another section of the religious community of that country. That was a position which had been absolutely justified by the relative position of the two Churches in Scotland and by the clear necessities of the religious and moral progress of Scotland. The Government had presented an alternative to the United Free Church which he could not help thinking was a cruel alternative. The Government said, in effect, that the United Free Church must leave their religious brethren in Scotland in a state of friction and of religious persecution, or else accept a clause in this Bill which was repugnant—although it might be accepted by a few members of the United Free Church—to the greater portion of the members of Scottish Nonconformity. They had been told in the course of this debate that English Nonconformists ought not to intervene in this particular issue, even on Clause 5 of the Bill. But surely they were not to accept the doctrine that in ecclesiastical, educational, or social questions they were not to interfere with the local opinion of other portions of the United Kingdom. The Church to which he belonged had considerable interests, religious, educational, and otherwise, in Scotland, and it was their duty to inquire how Clause 5 of this Bill was going to affect these and the interests of other religious federations. The Methodist Church in Scotland was far more numerous than this little Highland Church with its twenty-seven ministers. It had more congregations and raised a great deal more money; but it had more rigid ecclesiastical tests than either the United Free Church or the Free Church. He did not suppose that the Prime Minister had had occasion to study the constitution of the Scottish Methodists; but he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that they were tied up by more rigid conditions than those contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith. No Methodist minister in Scotland, or in England for that matter, could preach any doctrine which was not supposed to be discovered inside the standards of Methodism—which were John Wesley's sermons and his notes on the New Testament. If he did not do that he could be evicted from his church and could no longer be recognised as a Methodist minister or preacher.

They had to look at this Bill in view of certain union movements which were to take place in several of the Free Churches of this country. At the present moment there was a very strong movement for the union of three of the minor Churches of Methodism which split away more than half a century ago for a variety of reasons. If the union of these Churches was effected they would have to come to Parliament for authority, and when they came with their scheme to Parliament would be told that they could not be allowed to vary their original constitution, that they could not reunite, and that they would have to remain under conditions of antagonism, rivalry, and isolation, unless they liked to give to the Church of England some freedom in connection with its formulas. That was what they were bound to consider, as English Dissenters, in looking at this Bill. Nothing had been more striking during the last twenty-five years than the way the Methodist Church had been drawing away from the Church of England and assuming and exercising absolutely independent rights of her own. And that movement was likely to continue. This Bill was, therefore, a dangerous precedent to set to the Church of England, and it was the duty of English Dissenters to oppose it.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have listened with interest to the brief, but very clear, statement which the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken has given of his views, but I frankly admit that, to my thinking, his argument was one, not against Clause 5, but in favour of Clause 5. What is the legislative future which the hon. Gentleman pictures for this House? He says, and, in my judgment, he says with perfect truth, that it will in the future be found that the assent and assistance of this House is required in order to enable some of the great Nonconformist Churches in England to develop, to unite, to obtain that measure of spiritual freedom which is not always attained by separation from the State; and I can assure him that, in the prospect which he thus holds out, I for one shall always be found upon the side of union and upon the side of freedom. But how he thinks that either the cause of union or the cause of freedom can be furthered by this parlous objection to the smallest alteration being made in the Act of 1693 in relation to the Scottish Established Church altogether passes my comprehension. I do not wish to go into the niceties of argument which from time immemorial have been raised when questions of the relations between Church and State have come before either secular or ecclesiastical tribunals. In truth, the history, not merely of the Protestant Church, but of all Churches, is largely taken up with attempting to find some clear, logical, impeccable formula which shall, in unmistakable terms, determine the precise relation in which the civil power should stand to the spiritual. No such formula has ever yet been found; no such formula, in my opinion, ever will be found. And for a very plain and pregnant reason, which is that human society and the interests of various portions of human society are so intimately interwoven, and are so absolutely inseparable in practice, that, devise what theories you please, lay down what principles you like, you will always find the spiritual interfering with the secular, and you will never be able to avoid the secular interfering with the spiritual.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Oh.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think not. And could I have a better proof of it than the speech which has just been made? The hon. Gentleman has told us that in the interests of the spiritual welfare of the great religious community to which he belongs, he looks forward to coming to this House for assistance in dealing with property, no doubt, in the first case; but you cannot deal with charitable religious trusts without touching the doctrines connected with them. It cannot be done; and, although there is not any mention in this Bill of any formulas of either of the two Churches to which the Bill primarily belongs, can anybody deny that, implicitly if not explicitly, this House is creating, and cannot help but create, a religious trust? And directly you create a religious trust you must, explicitly or implicitly, settle on what religious terms that religious trust is to be held.

MR. PERKS: May I say that the Methodist Church has been twice to Parliament, dealing with millions worth of property, and on neither occasion has

Parliament thought it desirable or necessary to interfere with the religious trusts by which such property is held.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I understood the hon. Gentleman looked forward to a period when he and his friends would have to apply to this House on a question on which their existing trusts, which are bound up with religion, with formulas, with doctrine, which are inseparable from doctrine——

Mr. PERKS: Not our doctrinal trusts. On our constitutional union we should have to come to Parliament, but not for any variation of our doctrinal trusts.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know the precise terms on which the trusts of the Wesleyan Church are held; but if that great religious Church carries with it any doctrinal significance at all, and I presume it does, then if the doctrinal terms are to be altered, the Wesleyan Church will have to come to this House to enable it to retain the property while altering its formulas. And for my own part—I do not speak for anybody else; other people may, and do, take a stricter view of the nature of religious trusts than I do—I shall always be found on the side of union and on the side of freedom. But do not let anybody imagine that by any refinements of logic you will ever be able wholly to separate the interests of an ecclesiastical body from that great secular organisation of which, after all, it is a part, from which it derives its authority, and by whose support, and by whose support alone, it retains its property. After all, let it be remembered, when appeals have been made to us, as they have been made, not to destroy the utility of the United Free Church by depriving it of its property, or what is supposed to be its property, that, in itself, is an appeal to Cæsar, as was said by my hon. friend the Member for Durham.

I myself think there is a good deal of confusion about this question of spiritual independence as it was conceived by our forefathers, and as it is conceived at the present time at any rate by large bodies of Christians. I feel confident that no student of ecclesiastical history will ever suppose that those who struggled for spiritual independence struggled for the right to modify their creed. They never took it into their heads that their creed either could be modified, or ought to be modified, without serious spiritual danger to the whole religious body to which they belonged. Now when people talked of spiritual independence they did not mean the desire simply to keep as free as possible from State interference. They mean also the power not to modify the fundamental and essential doctrines which lay at the basis of their religious creeds, but to modify those formulas of subscription which time inevitably makes old, which the progress of knowledge, the changes that take place in the sphere of philosophy and the sphere of criticism, the changes which no formulas will guard you against, render somewhat inappropiate to the religious needs of any given time. These two meanings are quite distinct; and when I hear hon. Gentlemen talk as though they were now struggling, as though they now desired, to retain the sort of spiritual independence of which our forefathers spoke, I think they have not taken adequate account of the great change which has taken place, not in one body of Christians, but in all bodies of Christians, not in one Church, but in all Churches.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY made an observation which was quite inaudible in the Reporters' Gallery.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: We are not suggesting any change. It is historic fact. I think a change has taken place, and I think every Church is conscious of it, The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down told us that he had reason to believe that the great body of the United Free Church in Scotland were opposed to Clause 5 of the Bill. I believe he did that great body an injustice. He also talked as if we had deliberately tried to put a pistol to the head of the United Free Church and to say to them, "We know you strongly object on conscientious grounds to doing anything in regard to the Act of 1693, but unless you will do this violence to your beliefs you cannot have that relief from Parliament which otherwise we should be ready to give you." Sir, just as I think the hon. Gentleman greatly misrepresented the views of the United Free Church when he said that they objected to this relaxation, so he certainly has greatly misrepresented the views of His Majesty's Government in introducing this clause into the Bill. We desire no corrupt bargain in the matter. It was no question of *do ut des*, no question of giving up on either side a cherished conviction.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): Why not make it into two Bills?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Well, because, as the hon. Gentleman knows, if it were in two Bills it would not pass. [Ironical cheers.] May I ask what there is in that perfectly plain and candid statement to provoke ironical cheers? Is that a discreditable motive, is that a Parliamentary intrigue, is that a course which any statesman need be ashamed to take? On the contrary, I think it is plainly justified and plainly consistent with common sense and common prudence.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): May I ask, as we were challenged for the reason for cheering, why would it not pass in two Bills, if it is so excellent and good a thing?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Well, now, did anybody ever hear anything like that? The right hon. Gentleman listens every day to a cross fire which I have to undergo at Question time with regard to measures as to which it is impossible for me to promise the smallest hope that we shall be able to pass them into law this session. They are all good Bills, all excellent measures; does that secure their passage? Does the right hon. Gentleman's experience of his own period of office suggest that all the good Bills which he and his friends contrived to devise, because they were good, were therefore likely to pass? We all know under what pressure legislation is carried on in this House, we all know the difficulties which beset its path. We think that this clause is really relevant to the interests of Presbyterianism in Scotland; and in dealing with what will be a great settlement of a great Presbyterian difficulty we think that we are amply justified in taking the course we are taking. I defend that on general grounds as well as on particular grounds.

I spoke just now of the interests of Presbyterianism in Scotland. I refuse to regard the interests of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland except under the broader formula of the interests of Presbyterianism in Scotland. The hon. and learned Member for the Border Burghs was good enough to praise some words which fell from me long before this unhappy controversy arose, on the occasion of the junction of the then United Presbyterian Church and the then Free Church. Sir, I withdraw nothing that I then said. I rejoiced in that union; I mourn over the separation which has since taken place. I regret it. I think it is melancholy. I look forward in the future, perhaps not in the near future, but in the future, to a union amongst all these bodies. All of them sprang from one fountain-head. The paths which they have severally pursued have never widely deviated so far as doctrine or theology is concerned; and though there have been controversies, bitter controversies, they have been connected, not, as I think, and not, I believe, as any impartial critic will think, with the essential doctrines of religion, but rather with the external relations of the Church and the State. Still, surely, it is not beyond the powers of Christian wisdom, and that which is the root of Christian wisdom, Christian charity, to do something in the future which will heal these most unnecessary wounds, self-inflicted, as I think, upon the great body of the Presbyterian Church in times gone by. That is a general reason why I think anything which is germane to one of the greatest of these bodies, the parent, after all, of all of them, is not out of place when we are dealing with the best interests of the United Free and the Free Church.

But I think there is a more particular and even closer reason why you should do this thing. I think that the judgment of the House of Lords, and especially some observations made by the Lord Chancellor in the course of that judgment have, rightly or wrongly, made many of the adherents of every Presbyterian Church in Scotland consider whether the precise formulas of subscription, which in the case of clergy of the Church of Scotland we owe to the Act of 1693, ought not to be modified. Let me remind those Members of the House who are not Scottish Members of a reason which affects the Church of Scotland in a manner in which it can affect no other religious body that I know of, certainly none on this side of the Tweed, and certainly not the Church of England. The ecclesiastical Courts of the Church of Scotland are the absolute arbiters in all cases of heresy; that is to say, the test whether a man has or has not violated the ecclesiastical and theological principles of the Church goes, not to any civil tribunal or any tribunal with a civil admixture, but to ecclesiastical Courts with which the civil tribunals have no title whatever to interfere. And who constitute these tribunals? They are constituted, as everybody knows, of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; and in that General Assembly there is, if not a half, very nearly a half of lay elders. The lay elders, therefore, are a part of the spiritual organisation of the Church. They are not merely members, but a part of its spiritual organisation. They form an element in its Courts. They have power of deciding on the great questions on which the Church is the only arbiter. The Church has the power of deciding the formula of subscription of these office-bearers, and it has decided it, and decided in a very wise, sober, and conservative spirit, which makes it perfectly certain, I think, that no liberty that will be given to the Established Church is likely to be abused.

But is there not an extraordinary inconsistency in giving the Church liberty to settle the terms of subscription of some of its office-bearers and denying any liberty of settling the terms of subscription of other office-bearers? Mind, it is bound in both cases by the Act of 1690. It is not suggested in this Bill that any power should be given to the Church to depart from the Act of 1690, or to prove faithless to the sum and substance of the Reformed doctrine as set forth in the Westminster Confession. That is not proposed, and I do not believe that any power of that sort is even claimed by the United Free Church, although I believe that they arrogate to themselves, and perhaps rightly, a theoretical claim to alter their formulas and make themselves into Roman Catholics or members of the Orthodox Church, or of any Church which exists or ever has existed. Whether a liberty of that kind is of any value I do not know, but I am sure that it will never be exercised by the United Free Church. They will do in the future as they have done in the past; they will do in the future what I hope the Church of Scotland will be permitted to do—they will adhere to the sum and substance of the doctrine of the Reformed Church, and they will not put aside as a statement of useless historical doctrines the Westminster Confession, which has borne so marvellous a part in educating and developing the mind and the religious feeling of the people of Scotland.

Now, Sir, the point I want to press on the House is that until the Lord Chancellor gave his judgment it was possible—I think it is still possible, but it was not only possible, but easy, before that—for the members of the Church of Scotland to say that the Ecclesiastical Courts were really the authority that determined the theology of the Scottish Church, and that doctrines which were never regarded as heretical by the Church Courts were doctrines which might be held and preached by the ministers of the Church. I do not myself individually dissent from that view now. Speaking for myself, I should be inclined to hold it still. But if you do not introduce this fifth Clause you will touch the consciences, perhaps the over-sensitive consciences, of many of those who are anxious to be ordained, who are ready to devote their lives to the spiritual interests of the Church, become its ministers, and preach its doctrines, but who examine, with perhaps over-scrupulous care, the terms of subscription and do not take into account those broader considerations to which I individually should be inclined to give so much weight. Cannot we, ought not we to do something for these people? Is it not monstrous unfairness to say to them, "The theology of the Established Church does not differ from the theology of the United Free Church, but the way to the one is barred, and the way to the other is not barred." It is no question, of course, of competition for ability. The House will not suspect me of looking at it from so poor and mean a level. But I think it is a very great hardship that you should allow a man with conscientious views, such as I have described, to be an elder of the Church, to be a member of the General Assembly of the Church and to form part of the Court which judges cases of heresy, but should not allow him to be a minister of the Church. I think it is a great absurdity. I think it is worse than an absurdity. I think it is a great hardship.

As to those who think we are uprooting the historical foundations of the Church of Scotland, may I remind them that the legislative Charter of the Scottish Church is not the Act of 1693, which Clause 5 does touch, but the Act of 1690, which Clause 5 does not touch. It may seem a paradox, but it is nevertheless a historical truth that the Act of 1693 was more or less forced upon the Scottish Church in the interest, strangely enough, of what would now be called liberal theology. The Act of 1693 was passed by William III. in order to compel the Scottish Church to admit certain ministers who had been Episcopalians and whom the Church was desirous of excluding from the ministry at the time of the Revolution. It is that stringent Act which was then passed, strangely enough, in the interest of so-called liberalism, and that Act alone, which we propose to alter. What was thought sufficient for the mother Church of all Scottish Presbyterians at the time of the great Reformation settlement surely is enough for the Established Church of Scotland in the year 1905? I venture to claim that, while doing an act of justice to the members of the Scottish Church and doing it in a Bill which, in my judgment, is strictly relevant to that object, we are doing it in a manner so moderate, so constitutional, and so carefully observant of all the traditions and foundations of Presbyterianism in Scotland, that I do not believe even those who are most anxious to stand by the old ways, those who are most suspicious of all modern innovation, can, in truth, find any just reason to complain of our action.

MR. FINDLAY (Lanarkshire, N.E.), speaking from personal knowledge of the circumstances, said the desire for union which had gone on for many years matured during 1900. A small minority dissented, and the present troubles grew out of that dissent. The United Free Church represented one-fourth of the whole population of Scotland, while not 2 per cent. of the population was connected with what was known as the legal Free Church. It was believed that the union would open up a new era in the religious life of Scotland. As a member of the United Presbyterian Church, he had his own views on certain matters which had been introduced into the Bill. He respected the small minority of ministers who did not feel disposed to enter the union, but he could not fail to realise that they represented on this question a dying cause, and one which could not in the spirit of the age make progress, whereas the United Free Church, notwithstanding the past year of great peril, had gone on progressing, and raised over a million of money, and had shown a spirit and heart which they should all rejoice to see in connection with Christian work.

In regard to the judgment given in August last, he could not permit himself to express his opinion of it. He did not regard this Bill as an appeal to Cæsar. The United Free Church did not ask for liberties which it did not possess already. The judgment, which had been characterised by many as a monstrous injustice, had required the United Free Church to come to Parliament to get the wrong righted. The conscience of Scotland in regard to the equity of the situation had been aroused, and a demand had been raised for a speedy judgment and a free-handed Executive Commission to deal equitably with the matter at issue. He felt privileged at being in Parliament when this great issue was before it, and it would be a great satisfaction if he were able to help in righting the wrong which had been done. He hoped the Bill would quickly pass, and that the result would be to restore harmony in Scotland and enable that Church which had shown such marvellous recuperative power to continue its great work not only for Scotland but for the nation and the Empire. He regarded the introduction of Clause 5 as a mistake, but he hoped the Bill would be pushed through and put an end to the litigation and heart-burning which they all regretted.

*SIR WALTER THORBURN (Peebles and Selkirk) deeply regretted that the old sore had to some extent been reintroduced into this debate. The desire of the House—at all events the object which he and many others had in view—was to bring back peace and concord to Scotland. No one was more sincerely anxious than he to see a just and equitable settlement of this question. He regretted it had not been possible for the two parties to meet in conference and arrive at a settlement which Parliament would have been only too glad to confirm, as it would pass the wit of man to frame a measure which would be considered just by all parties, and he doubted whether even the Angel Gabriel could satisfactorily perform the task. Being a member of the Church itself he approached the question with an absolutely unbiassed mind. The Church of Scotland had admittedly endeavoured to steer an even keel between the parties. Whatever settlement was arrived at he was anxious to see just, and even generous, treatment given to the smaller body, the great majority of the congregations of which would be non-self-supporting. He wished most sincerely to see the United Free Church put in possession of ample means to carry out the great work which must fall upon it. A very large proportion of the congregations which would remain connected with the United Free Church were wealthy congregations; but at the same time he wished to see absolute justice meted out to them in connection with this matter. He was very glad indeed to notice that his right hon. friend the Lord-Advocate had deemed it fit and proper to make concessions in connection with this Bill. The Lord-Advocate was in possession of all the facts, and knew exactly what means the Church had at its disposal, and he was therefore in a better position to judge than hon. Members of this House who were not so familiar with the facts. Consequently he was glad to find that the Lord-Advocate saw his way to provide for the Free Church, and at the same time to avoid what was considered objectionable by the members of the United Free Church, namely, the pooling of all the resources of the Church.

He was in favour of giving large powers to the Executive Commission. There was upon that Commission a number of gentlemen of whom no one in Scotland could deny that they were high-minded and honourable, and he felt sure that they would give the most careful and independent consideration to everything that was put before them. They would hear all the evidence pro and con, and he was convinced that whatever judgment they propounded would be looked upon by the vast majority of the people of Scotland as being satisfactory and in the interests of justice. He felt that although their judgment might not be agreeable either to one or both of the bodies immediately concerned, at the same time he felt certain that their judgment would be founded on justice.

With regard to the 5th Clause, only the same liberty was being asked for the Church of Scotland as was enjoyed by the two other bodies. He did not know anyone in Scotland who objected on principle to the passing of Clause 5. It was admitted on all hands that this clause was desirable, and, if it was desirable, surely the House should not object to pass it. He regretted very much that hon. Members connected with the Nonconformist bodies of England had seen fit to interfere in this debate, and to move a Resolution which, if passed, would prove fatal to this Bill. Personally, he felt that those hon. Members were more actuated by the deliberations of the Liberation Society than by any particular interest in the settlement of this question. He looked upon the passing of Clause 5 as the first and most important step towards that greater union which he hoped was not very far distant. He believed it would pave the way for parties coming together, and the greatest aspiration of his life was to see all the Presbyterian bodies of Scotland united under one National Presbyterian Church. At the present time there was not the slightest doubt that both in the home field and in the mission field there was an enormous amount of overlapping, and this would be avoided by the union which he hoped to see brought about before very long. He trusted that if a division was pressed upon this question at any rate all hon. Members for Scotland would vote against this Resolution, and he hoped sincerely that when they divided upon the Second Reading of this measure it would be read a second time with very little difference of opinion between hon. Members representing Scotland.

MR. WHITLEY said that his hon. friend appeared to have based his remarks almost entirely upon the speech which preceded his own, and which he confessed himself not able entirely to comprehend. Therefore, perhaps, he would be pardoned if he endeavoured to put what he believed to be the position of English Nonconformists in this matter. First of all, he felt confident that as long as the Church was established they had a right to take an interest in its proceedingsand its methods, and, indeed, in both the creed and the formula of the Established Church. Otherwise why was the Church established and connected with the State. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would be prepared freely to admit that they had a right as Members of Parliament to take an interest in any Church that was by law established. So much for the justification of hon. Members taking an interest in a Bill which did not appear at first sight to affect their particular part of these islands. In his opinion there was a question of great importance brought in by Clause 5 of this Bill. They had been told over and over again that all Clause 5 did was to alter the formula of subscription for the Westminster Confession. Surely if the creed or Confession of the Church was out of date they ought to be able to alter it, and he entirely agreed with the Prime Minister in the view that men ought not to be "cabined and confined" to the formula of bygone ages. He would like to see the utmost liberality and freedom in the revision of creeds which, after all, were not divine, but were merely the attempts of men putting into words what their conception for the time being was of the ideas they were trying to preach. To come forward with the proposal to relax the doctrinal requirements of a Church by means of retaining the creed as it was and altering the formula of subscription seemed to him not exactly a straightforward proceeding. They must look on this matter not merely as it affected the comfort of a particular Church. The chief thing was not the comfort of persons in a Church, but the effect on the Church as a mission to those outside the Church. His chief objection to the proposal lay in the fact that this was a step toward relaxation not by the courageous method of revising a creed out of date, but by inventing some formula of subscription which might ease tender consciences. The effect of this on the opinion of those outside the Church was not likely to lead to the effectual carrying out of the mission in which the Church was engaged. He believed the Prime Minister would agree with him entirely in that. He did not like to use the word dishonest, but it seemed to him a little evasive to alter the formula of subscription while retaining the creed unaltered.

What kind of formula were they to have under Clause 5? It was not stated in the Bill. It might be altered, he presumed, from time to time. He would ask the Prime Minister whether it would not be possible to draw up a formula to enable a person to subscribe to the Westminster Confession in a frame of mind such as that which was shown in the right hon. Gentleman's most interesting book "Foundations of Belief." He had no doubt that such a formula could be invented. While he and his friends were certainly in favour of the utmost liberty in doctrinal matters, and ready to do all they could to enable not only this Church but all Churches to march with the progress of knowledge and of thought, they could not see that either by the device of Clause 5, or by retaining

State control over a Church, those ideals could ever be reached.

With regard to the endowments of the legal Free Church—the small minority which won the case in the House of Lords—he said as a Free Churchman that he believed there was no greater evil which they could do to a Church than to provide money which would remove the incentive to effort. The words "to provide adequately for the Free Church" as they stood in the Bill meant that out of the moneys belonging to the United Free Church enough was to be taken to support the ministers and fabrics—in fact, to provide the money required in full and ample quantity for this tiny Church consisting of about twenty-six congregations. It was a proposal to endow that Church with an amplitude of money which would make them independent of any of their own efforts. As a Free Churchman he said there was no surer way to kill a Church than to do that. Although a particular Church might ask for, and wish to get, as much money as they could get. the right hon. Gentleman would find, if he considered that aspect of the question, that the most cruel thing he could do to any Church was to endow them in such a way that no effort was required from their own supporters.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said the Bill was the result of litigation between the majority and the minority of the members of the Free Church in order to determine their rights as to the property of the Church at the time of the union with the United Presbyterian Church. The result of the litigation had been to deprive the majority of all property in the Church, the whole of it being given to the minority. The Royal Commission had reported that the minority was not in a position to carry out the trust which had been handed to them by the House of Lords, and in these circumstances Parliament was called upon to legislate in order that a trust which had practically lapsed or become inoperative might be made operative. It made no difference to Parliament what was the purpose of the trust. It might, as in this case, be a Church, or it might be an educational endowment, or it might be a beneficiary scheme. In all cases Parliament dealt with the trust and endeavoured to legislate in such a manner as to make the trust operative, having regard to the changed circumstances, with the view of carrying out the intentions of the donor. He quite agreed that the decision of the House of Lords was a final judgment of a Court of law in this matter, and he also agreed that any action which this House might take must be based on principle. Therefore, as the Lord-Advocate had stated, the first consideration should be the adequate provision for the due performance of the purposes for which the funds were raised. Neither was he disposed to quarrel very much with the Lord-Advocate's second proposal that the provision made for the equipment of the Free Church must be according to the standard in other Presbyterian Churches.

Now, Churches did not exist for private profit; if that had been the case the House of Lords would have distributed the money at once to the parties legally entitled to it. There was this peculiarity about Church properties, that they were endowments gathered up for the purpose of carrying on the work of the Church, and in order to aid the voluntary efforts and self-sacrifices of those who carried on the work of the Church. Therefore, in carrying out the trust it was not a question of giving money to this person or that, but of imposing on the Church which got the money a burden in order that she might carry out the trust by an equipment suitable to the number of its members. He quite recognised that the minority were entitled to some consideration. They were conscientiously opposed to the Church going into the Union, and they fought their case in the Courts of law, and succeeded in the end in vindicating their rights. On the other hand, he had considerable sympathy for the United Free Church, and for this reason; that that Church separated from the Established Church in 1843 on the ground that they desired the Church to have spiritual independence, and to have the right to legislate on Church matters free from State control. The Free Church was told at that time that they could not be a State Church and receive State endowments, and at the same time have spiritual independence. On being told so, the ministers and members of the Free Church at once acquiesced in the situation, gave up their churches, manses, and all their other property, and formed themselves into a Church founded and supported entirely on the free-will offerings of the people. Having done that, they naturally thought that the Church had obtained her freedom. The very object of a constitution was to protect the rights of a minority, and to bind down the Church to a certain course of action. The effect of a constitution was to bind the Church as a whole, and it enabled the Law Courts to come in and interpret the contract. That was exactly what was done in this case. The Free Church founded itself on a purely voluntary principle, by which he meant the principle of self-sacrifice and of paying their own way. Many of the members stated that they still adhered to the Establishment principle, and that they would prefer to be an Established Church, but having been told that that was impossible so long as they maintained the principle of spiritual independence, they accepted the situation, and the Establishment principle then became a merely academic question, and the Free Church thereafter was carried on in every respect as a purely voluntary Church.

What, then, was the position of the Free Church and of the United Presbyterian Church? They found that in Scotland there was a good deal of over-lapping in Church work, and they came to the conclusion that, as they were both voluntary Churches, they should unite on the basis of being supported by the free-will offerings of the people. They took the very highest legal opinion in Scotland on the subject, and that opinion was that a union would be perfectly lawful, and that it could be accomplished without any danger to their funds or their property. The Scotch Law Courts also unanimously decided in favour of the Union. What more could an association of persons for Church and religious purposes have done to protect themselves than to act according to the highest legal opinion in Scotland, corroborated by the unanimous opinion of the Scotch Bench? The decision of the House of Lords had certainly caused the greatest surprise throughout the whole of Scotland, and the members and ministers of the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church were in no way to blame for the result. Forty years ago he had to do with a similar matter when the Reformed Presbyterian Church united with the Free Church. He was in the position of advising the minority in the Reformed Presbyterian Church, who wanted to claim the property of that Church, and he took the view that the property must go with the majority. He was as satisfied then, as the House of Lords was now satisfied, that the minority had a good title to claim the property of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; but if they had got that property it would have been a trust which would have had to be carried out at great expense. What he advised, then, was that they should hold fast; and now, by virtue of the House of Lords decision, they had the whole property.

Reference had been made to Clause 5. He considered that it ought not to have been introduced into the Bill at all. It had no relation to it. What Parliament was doing was practically settling a dispute between two private parties respecting private property. If the matter had been dealt with by a Committee upstairs it would have been held that the Church of Scotland had no *locus standi*. The Act of 1693 imposed certain formulas on the Church; but anyone who was a lawyer would know that in a Church there was not only spiritual jurisdiction, but civil rights. It was not sufficient to hold that a clergyman must be bound by the Confession of Faith; he got the living through the patron, and that was a civil right which the ecclesiastical Courts could not interfere with. In 1693 it was necessary to bring in an Act of Parliament to make it obligatory on ministers to sign the Confession of Faith; and under that Act the Civil Courts were given jurisdiction. He thought it was a mistake that Clause 5 should have been introduced into the Bill at all. There was no use in saying that the Church of Scotland was supreme in these matters, because there was an appeal to the Courts as to whether any action of the

General Assembly was *ultra vires* or not. The House was asked on the *ipse dixit* of the General Assembly to give power to alter the formula, but the King's Commissioner who opened and closed the General Assembly declared that the Church was under the control of the State; and that its creed must be ratified by Act of Parliament. He thought, therefore, it was a pity that the Church of Scotland, taking advantage, apparently, of the necessity of the Free Church, should have interfered at all. Where were their interests affected? Whatever might be argued in this House there could be no doubt whatever about the feeling of the people of Scotland regarding what seemed to be a little sharp practice on the part of the Church of Scotland. No one would object to the Church of Scotland having freedom, if it did not have a State endowment. It was monstrous to say that a Church which had all the endowments of a State was to have the same freedom as those which paid their own way. In the voluntary Churches if the people were not satisfied they stopped the supplies, but in an Established Church where there was an endowment there could be no question of such a thing; the people simply left. Was the Church here to have the power of altering its formula and changing it by the vote of a majority. It was not reasonable. If there was a minority opposed to that change was there to be another split? Was the House of Lords to be once more applied to to say that the change in the formula was *ultra vires*, and that therefore the property must pass to the minority who protested against this change. If they once opened a door of that kind there would be no end to disagreements in the Church. Let them put their formula into an Act of Parliament and then the Church would have to obey it.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 203; Noes, 63. (Division List No. 275.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW(Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt Hn Sir MichaelHicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bond, Edward
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Bull, William James
Buxton, N.E(York, N.R, Whitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell, Rt Hn J A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J A (Worc
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalziel, James Henry
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dobbie, Joseph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt EC(SAndrw'sB'ghs
Elliot, Hn. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. SirJ(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, NE)
Finlay, RtHnSirR.B(Inv'rn'ss)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Fowler, Rt Hon. Sir Henry
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J E (Elgin &Nairn
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Halsey, Rt. Hn. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq of(L'nd'nd'rry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Heath, ArthurHoward (Hanley
Heath, Sir Jas. (Staffords. N.W.
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Joicey, Sir James
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lamont, Norman
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)

Lee, Arthur H (Hants,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Reginald J(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Crae, George
M‘Iver, SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
M‘Kean, John
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n)
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paulton, James Mellor
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Pirie, Duncan V.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hn. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt.Hn Col Edw. J.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, Wm. Edward T.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,Rt.Hn.J Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas(Somerset)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Tennant, Harold John
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, Rt Hn Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Whiteley, H.(Ashton undLyne)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,SirW. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt Hn E. R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burt, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lyell, Charles Henry
M‘Kenna, Reginald
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Mara, James
Parrott, William
Perks, Robert William
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Russell, T. W.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Woodhouse, SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Alfred Hutton and Mr. George White.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

And, there being no further Business set down for the Afternoon Sitting, Mr. Speaker left the Chair until the Evening Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means from this Evening's Sitting.

SUPPLY [JUNE 29TH].

Resolutions reported.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,768,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the *Personnel* for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on March 31st, 1906."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £4,816,900, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of the *Matériel* for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on March 31st, 1906."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £7,827,800, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Contract Work for Shipbuilding, Repairs, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on March 31st, 1906."

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) moved to reduce the Vote by £100. He did so, he said, in order to renew the protest, which he had made on a previous occasion against the continued expenditure at Wei-hai-Wei. He thought the Government should now face the question of clearing off these items of expenditure in connection with this bathing station.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out '£2,768,300,' and insert '£2.768,200' — (*Mr. Whitley*)— instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That, '£2,768,300, stand part of the Resolution."

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge) said if the hon. Gentleman believed this expenditure was only made for the purpose of a bathing establishment he had a perfect right to object to it, but this Vote, as a matter of fact, went a little further than that. Wei-hai-Wei was necessary as a summer base for the Fleet on the China Station. It was rendered necessary by the fact that the climate of Hong-Kong was very bad in the summer months, and, therefore, it was essential to have a summer base in which the Fleet could carry out its necessary training exercises. This was not a large expenditure, and it was fully justified, in the opinion of the Admiralty, by the training advantages offered by Wei-hai-Wei in respect to climate and situation.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth) said the hon. Gentleman opposite had asked his hon. friend the meaning of this increased expenditure at Wei-hai-Wei. That was a Question they were all entitled to ask, and he would repeat it because he happened to know something about the place and took an interest in this matter. A friend of his who had returned from South Africa was sent out to Wei-hai-Wei in a military capacity for the purpose of training troops. That gentleman had learned a good deal about the capacity and methods of the Boers, and had said it was extremely instructive to compare the capacity of the Chinese and the Boers, and he expressed his opinion that if we were going to retain this place for any length of time we should have a first-class Army composed of Chinese troops then in training which might be used to very great advantage to assist our forces in the Far East. But Wei-hai-Wei as a place of arms had come to a standstill, and he (Mr. Lucas) was rather curious to know what was the meaning of the increase of expenditure. The Secretary to the Admiralty had said that Wei-hai-Wei was a valuable adjunct to Hong-Kong, because Hong-Kong, as everybody who had been there knew, was not a very salubrious place in the summer. Wei-hai-Wei, therefore, had its advantages. He, for one, did not complain that the hon. Member had thought proper to move a reduction of the Vote. He hoped the Admiralty would not go to unnecessary expenditure, but as long as money was not wasted he did not think anybody could wisely complain of the very moderate increase which appeared in the Estimates this year.

Since the Vote came up on the last occasion several events had happened. Manœuvres had recently taken place, and it was of the first importance for us to know what had been the upshot of those manœuvres. He desired to explain to the Secretary of the Admiralty why he pressed him for as full an Answer as he felt justified in giving. Operations connected with the Navy were to a great extent concealed in mystery. To a large portion of the population the Navy was not only an unknown quantity, but an unseen quantity, and they had no means whatever of informing themselves as to what progress had been made with the Fleet in comparison with the fleets of other nations, or as to our naval requirements He did not ask what would be the result of putting to the test the preliminary operations which were decided on in time of peace; but he wished the Secretary to the Admiralty to satisfy, as far as he could, the questions which arose in the public mind, and solve the doubts which suggested themselves to the man who contemplated the possible result of a real contest with a great naval Power. Everybody knew something of what the Army was doing, and were inclined to form an opinion as to the capacity of the military forces. When the Army was put to the test it became a common saying that our military misfortunes were all learned in the Long Valley at Aldershot. What they wanted to be sure of was that in the event of our Navy being put to a similar trial there would be no danger of deficiencies being manifested which would imperil our position in a time of crisis. They wanted to know what reports had been received as to the naval manœuvres.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) contended that the hon. Member could not refer to the naval manœuvres on this Vote.

*MR. SPEAKER said if the hon. Member intended to lead up to the question of the construction of ships it might be in order; but the question of tactics would not be relevant to the Vote.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS said he was coming to a definite point respecting the *personnel* of the squadrons in reserve.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON submitted that only the *personnel* of the dockyards could be dealt with under the Vote.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS said he had plenty to say on the *personnel* of the dockyards, but if he were told he was not allowed to allude to the *personnel* of the Fleet, he would not pursue that point.

*MR. SPEAKER said he did not know what the hon. Member was going to say, but if he was going to discuss the quality of the men and the work they had done on the ships, that would not be relevant to the Vote, but if he proposed to discuss the construction of ships, he thought that might be in order.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS presumed that when ships were sent to sea for the manœuvres, the dockyards were interested in the question of their efficiency; but he would leave that point. He wanted to know, however, whether the Government could tell the House what was their policy in the matter of salvage work, whether they intended to develop the capabilities of the Royal Navy for doing its own salvage operations when necessary? That was a matter to which he had called attention recently, but had not received a reply from the representative of the Admiralty. He also wanted to know what was the present intention of the Admiralty in the matter of boilers. He stated the other day, from the best information he could get, that the Belleville boilers had been proved and were said to be the best available, not only because they gave the best record of steam power at sea, but because they could be better repaired at sea without sending the ship into harbour.

*Mr. SPEAKER observed the Belleville boilers were not manufactured in the Royal dockyards, and, therefore, could not be referred to on this Vote.

Mr. REGINALD LUCAS said he would not press the question; and if he were not permitted to refer to the manœuvres he had no more to say.

The Earl of DALKEITH (Roxburgh) said he was unfortunately not able to be present during the Committee stage of this Vote, and he had just one or two Questions to put. First of all he noticed the reduction of the Dockyard Votes for which a great deal of credit was taken. Although there had been a considerable decrease in wages there had been no corresponding decrease in salaries; on the contrary, there had been an increase. In the home dockyards there had been an increase of 2 per cent. in the salaries, and a decrease of 10 per cent. in the wages, while in the foreign dockyards the salaries were increased by 6 per cent., and the wages decreased by 20 per cent. The House should certainly have some explanation with regard to that. He also wished to know whether the reduction in wages was not to a large extent caused by the recent shipbuilding programme having been more or less completed, and the vessels to be kept in repair being of a newer type and therefore requiring fewer repairs. Since the Vote had been in Committee manœuvres had taken place which would perhaps give the Admiralty a better opportunity of saying how the new Admiralty scheme was working out. He did not wish to discuss those manœuvres at all, but he would like to know whether in consequence of manning the ships with what were termed nucleus crews for three and sometimes six months previous to the manœuvres, there had been a decrease in the work in the dockyards because of the ships being kept in better order, and whether, owing to their being kept in commission and being sent to sea, there had been fewer mishaps to them; because if that were so that would show that we had largely added to our efficiency by the course pursued. He also wished to know whether the Admiralty were satisfied with what was being done to keep the older ships in repair, and he would like to have some information as to whether the Admiralty did not consider there was a great risk in leaving those ships in their present state, a state in which they were absolutely useless. In the fight between Japan and Russia there were certainly two older armed cruisers than any which we had in our Navy, and that showed that it was advisable for the Committee not to be too keen in their criticisms, but that they might allow a small expenditure to be made so as to keep the machinery of these old ships in order, in case they were required in time of emergency.

With regard to the unfortunate accidents with the submarine, he wished to know what the Admiralty were doing or what they intended to do to prevent these accidents. There had been two very bad disasters with submarines, and they saw from the Press that the same unfortunate accidents occurred in foreign navies. He assumed that the boats which had suffered from those accidents were now in the hands of the dockyard authorities, and he would, therefore, like to know whether in the course of their investigations they had been able to find out if those accidents were due to faulty construction. He thought they ought to have some assurance that something was being done to prevent the occurrence of submarine accidents, and to secure the safety of the men who manned them. He understood that it was very difficult at the present time for the officers and men engaged on submarines to insure their lives at anything like the usual rates for men employed in the Navy. They had been told that the modern warships were going to be more heavily armed than in the past, and he wished to know whether it was due to the larger tonnage, or were they going to build them lighter and more in accordance with the "Swiftsure" design. He was inclined to think that the Admiralty had been taking rather too much credit for having effected great economies. He could quite see that there would be large economy in the dockyards' expenses and repairing if they were to have only comparatively new ships in the Navy. It was evident, however, that if a ship would get out of date quicker under the new system they would have to have a larger capital expenditure upon new ships. Although he admitted that a great deal had been done in this direction and great economy had been effected in regard to the dockyards, still they must not forget that there had been a sudden reversal of the policy which had been hitherto adopted, and, for all they knew, if another Government came into power they might make another change in the direction of adopting the policy of former years. Before making such very great changes and taking too much credit for the reductions which had been made in one year, the House should be allowed to form some judgment upon the question and see what chance there was of such a policy being continuous.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) said he should vote against the Amendment of the hon. Member opposite because he considered that it was only due to those men who endangered their lives by manning our ships and fighting our battles when required, that every precaution should be taken to provide places where they could recuperate their health. That was the object of the Government in carrying out the present policy in regard to Wei-hai-Wei. It was of great importance that if they had the best possible ships they should also have the best possible men, and they could not achieve this unless they showed more solicitude for the health and welfare of the men as they were doing by making arrangements at Wei-hai-Wei, whereby men whose health suffered would have an opportunity of recuperating. He thought the Government would make a great mistake if they refrained from maintaining the present state of things at Wei-hai-Wei.

He agreed with all that the noble Lord had said about submarines. They had recently had a very sad catastrophe, and he wished to impress upon the Government the importance of having in the dockyards the *personnel* and equipment necessary to grapple with such misfortunes when they did occur. The greatest possible credit was due to the men, in the case of the submerging of the submarine at Plymouth, for their courage, and the manner in which they did their utmost to raise the submarine as quickly as possible. He urged upon the Government the importance of having at each dockyard implements, equipment, and material of the best possible and most effective description to deal with such disasters in order to raise as quickly as possible a submarine in case of accident. When they read of the dreadful suspense and considered what those brave fellows had suffered, they would see the necessity of doing what he had suggested. He knew that the Secretary to the Amiralty was fully alive to the importance of this question, and he trusted that at Devonport and other dockyards he would see that everything was done that could be done to afford speedy relief in case of accidents of this kind.

With regard to the ships which were being withdrawn from the Navy, he agreed that it was unwise that ships of the second class should be kept in the first line of our naval defence, but if some of those vessels, instead of being sold at a small price to be broken up, were kept in reserve, the time might come when, pressed heavily by a severe naval engagement, those vessels might be of considerable service as supporters of the first line of defence. Having regard to the fact that our food supply depended upon the efficiency of the Navy, and the desirability of securing the best possible men to man our ships, it was important that they should not adopt a cheese-paring policy. He was sure that the taxpayer, although his burdens were very heavy at present, would rather pay a little more than see the Navy lacking the necessary funds to maintain it in a state of complete efficiency.

*MR. CUMMING MACDONA (Southwark, Rotherhithe) said he had been to Wei-hai-Wei. He admired the surroundings of that beautiful spot and it was a splendid place for the Fleet as a health resort to recuperate strength during the fearfully hot weather along the Southern Chinese Coast—a chain of mountains if linked together round the wide-stretching harbour of Wei-hai-Wei would form a magnificent harbour of refuge in the far Eastern Seas—and as a health resort was unequalled, for on the shores were wells bubbling with pristine medical waters of great curative power, well known to and appreciated by the Japanese when they held the place at the first capture of Port Arthur by them. Naval officers had informed him that in any weather ships of the largest tonnage could go into Wei-hai-Wei. Things had changed considerably in the Far East, and he thought that the Japanese had done a most marvellous deed in taking for the second time that wonderful fortress and harbour of Port Arthur. The present Prime Minister, as Foreign Minister in succession to Lord Salisbury, he thought, had shown wonderful prescience in obtaining a lease from China of Wei-hai-Wei. This was the act of a wise Government, and he thanked God that they had a Government in power which from past experience and knowledge—endorsed by the sentiment of the world had seen the wisdom of holding Wei-hai-Wei harbour as a base for future naval operations. Now that we had the Japanese as allies in possession once again of Port Arthur, he trusted that a renewed arrangement might be entered into with China and Japan by which we might have an extended lease for ever of this excellent harbour. It should not be forgotten that this country did 75 per cent. of the Chinese trade with foreigners, and China of her own free will was very pleased to give us the lease of Wei-hai-Wei for as long as Russia held Port Arthur. He would like to see the name of our Prime Minister for ever identified with the retention of this great harbour as one of his greatest masterpieces of foreign policy in the East. For the development of their trade and the prosperity of the Empire it was necessary to keep all the territory they had got. [Cries of "Divide, divide."] With regard to Newhaven he wished to point out that at this place there was a large valley which might easily be made into one of the finest dockyards in the world.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) said he was sure the House had listened with great pleasure to the personal reminiscences of the hon. Member for Rotherhithe. He wished to say a few words about the extraordinary proposition put forward by the Opposition upon this occasion. The hon. Member opposite had moved a reduction of this Vote without a speech, and that was somewhat extraordinary. He did not think it would be advisable to abandon Wei-hai-Wei at this moment. Had hon. Members opposite failed to see that one of the great disadvantages which Russia had been placed under in regard to her Navy during the present war had been that she had no ports convenient for her ships to go to. [OPPOSITION laughter and cries of "Oh, oh!"] That laughter proved that they read no other newspaper except the *Daily News*, which did not take up Imperial matters.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): It is the best paper in London.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY, continuing, said that the failure of Russia was largely due to the fact that she had no places in the Far East for her ships to go to to refit and coal. Hon. Members opposite did not appear to realise that times had changed somewhat since the days of Nelson. He thought he had now shown the hollowness of the Motion which had been moved by the hon. Member for Halifax. The Government had often been told that they were disrespectful to the House of Commons, but what greater disrespect could be shown to the House of Commons than to move an important reduction upon questions like this, and then decline to say anything in support of such a proposal. As to the question of repairs, he said he was in favour of the policy of having repairs done in the Government dockyards instead of in the yards of private firms. When a contractor built a new ship he estimated for a fixed sum, but a contractor could not give a definite estimate for repairs. He did not wish to cast reflections on the honesty of contractors, but he thought that in the interests of economy it was advisable that repairs should be done in Government dockyards. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] This was a matter of finance, and he was quite certain that the right policy was the one which the Government was now following. Contractors were human, and they were inclined to take advantage of the fact that it was impossible to say in advance how much repairing work would be absolutely necessary.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said the Amendment had reference to Wei-hai-Wei. He asked whether the hon. Member's remarks were relevant.

*MR. SPEAKER said Wei-hai-Wei was one of the subjects, but the discussion had ranged over the whole of Section 1 of the Vote.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to move that the Question be now put.

*MR. SPEAKER said if the hon. Member's Motion had related solely to Wei-hai-Wei he would have accepted it, but a great many other questions had been raised to which the Motion, if accepted, would also apply.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said he was glad to see that there was a decrease in the cost for "teams." He understood that there had been a considerable waste of public money in connection with that item in former years.

SIR WILLIAM TOMLINSON (Preston) said he wished to draw the attention of the Admiralty to the subject of submarines. These vessels were only in the experimental stage, and he found that not only in our own experience but in that of foreign countries their use was attended with serious danger to those on board. He wished to ask whether the Government had under consideration the adoption of means to provide against that danger. He hoped the scientific resources of the dockyard authorities were not unequal to the task of devising some method of providing the safety which was desired.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.) said the amount stated in the Vote for Wei-hai-Wei in respect of salaries and allowances was very small, and it did not involve any great question of policy. If we held Port Arthur it would be unnecessary to stick to Wei-hai-Wei, but he considered it desirable that we should have it, seeing that we had really no other place of our own north of Hong-Kong. Hon. Members might say, "Why do you want Wei-hai-Wei when you have an alliance with Japan?" It should be remembered that we might be at war with another Power, and that Japan might be a neutral. It was conceivable that we might be in hostility with Japan, and therefore it was perfectly clear that we should have no dockyard at all in the neighbourhood if we gave up Wei-hai-Wei, and also that we should have no coaling station. Recent events had made the northern portion of the China Seas infinitely more important than it was in former years.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.): It is not a dockyard, it is a bathing establishment.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON said that was the contention of the hon. Member, but he did not think the House would accept that view.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY: Has the hon. Gentleman been there?

MR. CALDWELL: Yes, I have.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON said if Wei-hai-Wei was only a bathing establishment he would not be in favour of retaining it, but he contended that under certain circumstances which might arise it would be of the greatest use to us. He called attention to the charge of £90 in the Vote for the Naval Store Depot at the West India Docks, and asked why so small a sum was allotted for that store. In the matter of expenditure on naval works he had always felt that more should be done for Ireland. One of the best places where ships could be built and repaired for the Royal Navy was Haulbowline, but it was in a position of distinct inferiority to almost all the other docks. He suggested that something should be done to improve its position.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARTHUR LEE, Hampshire, Fareham) regretted that certain hon.

Members should have treated the question of the provision of a sanatorium for the China Fleet as a joke. He had served on the China Station through three summers, and the climate at that season was indeed no joke. It was of the utmost importance to the Fleet that some healthy place should be chosen where the ships could go, and the men could carry out their shore exercises. The present expenditure on Wei-hai-Wei was only for the purpose of fitting the place as a sanatorium; it was moderate in amount, and it was money well spent. He would remind hon. Members that important events were taking place in the Far East, and surely it was only right that we should do everything in our power to make the best out of the lease of Wei-hai-Wei which we had obtained from China.

The question of dockyard salvage plant in relation to submarines was a very difficult one. The public and the Press had perhaps naturally jumped to the conclusion that if such plant had been maintained the deplorable loss of life in connection with the Submarines A1 and A8 would have been obviated. The Admiralty, aware of the deep feeling excited in the country, had given anxious consideration to the matter, but there were many objections to keeping salvage plant to be used in the event of possible accidents to submarines. It was obvious that the expense could only be justified by the hope or assurance of increasing the chance of saving life. But these accidents did not necessarily take place close to a port or dockyard. The modern submarine had a very large radius of action, and it was merely a coincidence that the accidents in the case of the Submarines A1 and A8 took place at a short distance from port. In the case of the A1, the lives of the crew were destroyed with such rapidity that no salvage plant, however near, could have saved them. In regard to A8, again, according to the best information of the Admiralty, the crew could not have remained alive for more than forty minutes; and it would not have been possible for the most efficient salvage plant to get from the dockyard and raise the vessel in that short time.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said they could have lived for more than forty minutes as was shown the other day in the case of the French submarine which sank.

*Mr. ARTHUR LEE said that the information of the Admiralty was that the crew could not have lived for more than forty minutes. He was not in a position to speak of the French submarine, because the Admiralty were not yet in possession of definite information as to what had happened. If hon. Members consulted any one familiar with the operations of salvage companies they would find that there was no sort of stock-plant that could be applied to every type of vessel. Each case required almost special plant, and as far as salving the vessel itself was concerned there was no need for the Admiralty to keep its own plant. The important part of these salvage operations was the work done by specially trained divers, who must be constantly employed to be kept efficient. The Admiralty could not keep salvage divers constantly employed, and so they thought it was better to depend on private enterprise for salvage work.

As to executing the repairs to the Fleet in the Royal dockyards, that question had been gone into very thoroughly at the Admiralty during the last few months, and the Admiralty had decided that the policy in the future would be to execute all the repairs of the Fleet in normal times in the dockyards. It was quite true that recently a good deal of the work had been given to private yards; but that was because the arrears had become so great. The Admiralty did not disguise the fact that the cost of repairs was greater in private yards than in the Royal dockyards.

Sir JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said he had the very greatest doubt of that.

*Mr. ARTHUR LEE said he hoped he was not reflecting on any interest in which the hon. Member was concerned.

Sir JAMES JOICEY said he was not interested in any private yard for repairing war ships, but he was satisfied that the cost of repairs in private yards was not greater than in the dockyards.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE: The Admiralty had only one thing to consider in this matter and that was economy, and there was no doubt whatever that the cost of repairs in private yards had been considerably greater than it was in the Government yards. They had, therefore, decided that all repairs that it was possible to effect in the Government yards should be carried out there. With regard to a suggestion that had been made by the hon. Member for Rotherhithe that a new dockyard for repairs should be made at Newhaven, that scheme was apparently intended to include a harbour of shelter for merchant ships and fishing boats. He could only say that it was not the policy of the Admiralty to increase the number of dockyards indiscriminately, but rather to improve the efficiency of those in existence. He was afraid, therefore, he could not hold out any hope that this suggestion would be seriously considered.

An important point had been raised as to the establishment of nucleus crews, and its effect on the amount of repairs done in the dockyards. He knew there had been apprehension in the dockyards as to the falling off of the amount of repairs that would ordinarily be done in them; but the keeping of nucleus crews on board the ships who could remedy small defects was not only proving a great economy in preventing deterioration, but had also given most useful employment to artificers and the nucleus crews. He had been asked a question with regard to Haulbowline. He was afraid he could not hold out much hope that the amount of repairs there would be largely increased but there were certain works in progress, and when they were completed the opportunities for the employment of labour there would probably increase. The railwayfication of the dockyards, now in progress, would do away with much horse and man power in the transport of materials, and that would involve an enormous saving.

MR. WOLFF (Belfast, E.), amid loud and continued cries of "Oh, oh!" and "Divide," rose to continue the debate.

MR. WHITLEY rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 157; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 2'6.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds)
Bigwood, James
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brassey, Albert
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Burke, E. Haviland
Buxton, N. E(York, N.R, Whitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A.(Worc.)
Chapman, Edward
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cremer, Wm. Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Delany, William
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Rt. Hn. Ailwyn Edwd.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E)
Finlay, Rt. Hn. Sir R. B(Inv'rn's
Fisher, William Hayes
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of(L'nd'nderry
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse

Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt Hn Col. W.
Lamont, Norman
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol, S
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh,W.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Mount, William Arthur
Murphy, John
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Parrott, William
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Pretyman, Ernest George
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle ofWight)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew
Sheehy, David
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Tuff, Charles
Turnour, Viscount
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. J. H. Whitley and Mr. Dalziel.

NOES.

Arrol, Sir William
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir J. C.
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.
Gordon, Hn. J.E(Elgin&Nairn
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, Sir Jas. (StaffordsN.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Reid, James (Greenock)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und Lyne

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Wolff and Mr. Purvis.

Question put accordingly, "That '£2,768,300' stand part of the Resolution."

The House divided:—Ayes, 115; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 277.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn.G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beach,Rt Hn SirMichael Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.JA(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt.Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Rt. HnAilwynEdwd.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay,Rt.Hn.Sir R.B(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredck.
Gordon, Hn. J.E(Elgin&Nairn
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq of(L'nd'nd'rry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hn. Claude George
Heath, ArthurHoward (Hanley
Heath, SirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hill, Henry Staveley

Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F (Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Reid, James (Greenock)
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sadler, Col Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Burke, E. Haviland
Buxton, N.E(York,NR,Whitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Findlay, Alexander(LanarkNE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Lamont, Norman
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Redmond, John E (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Seely, Maj. J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.
Sheehy, David
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred (Merthyr
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Woodhouse, Sir J T(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. J. H. Whitley and Mr. Dalziel.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. DALZIEL said he regretted that the short time which was now available would prevent them from discussing some of the more important questions which they were anxious to get to earlier in the evening, but from some unexplained cause the supporters of the Government preferred to occupy the time. He desired to obtain some information from the Secretary to the Admiralty upon various points. He wished to know whether the hon. Gentleman saw any reason for altering the decision of the Admiralty with reference to the receiving of deputations of workmen at the Government dockyards. He did not see why the hon. Gentleman should not receive such deputations provided that they were thoroughly representative of the particular branch of labour which they were supposed to represent. The ordinary course was to send written representations, but that was unsatisfactory, and the men complained that they were not brought properly into touch with the Admiralty. With regard to discharges at the dockyards he should like to know the number who had, up to the present been discharged, and perhaps the Secretary to the Admiralty would not mind telling them when he expected that these weekly discharges would stop. The Government had promised to do something for the unemployed, but he did not think discharging men in this way would carry out that promise. He also wished to know why the Admiralty had adopted the plan of doing more of their work in private dockyards, and whether anything had been done in reference to the payment of a living wage to some classes of the men employed. He noticed that whilst something like £202,000 less was being paid in wages the salaries had gone up by £3,677. He thought this fact required some explanation.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE said that with regard to what had been said about receiving deputations at the Admiralty, his point was that they refused to receive the recognised leaders of trades unionists. Almost all the large employers of labour arranged trade disputes through the trades unions, but the Government still clung to the old tradition that matters in dispute between themselves and their workmen must be settled directly. This attitude was against the best interests of the public service, because the loss of time in dealing separately and directly with each section of the workpeople was very great. If such disputes were settled through the union officials and properly discussed, there would be greater peace and harmony amongst the workmen, and consequently better work in the various departments. The Postmaster-General had recently used very strong language because the Post Office employees had circularised Members of Parliament, but Government employees

Mr. Dalziel.

had no option but to take this course when they were subjected to such treatment as he had described. In reference to contract work *versus* direct employment, he did not know whether hon. Members were aware of the great disparity which existed between the value of the work done in the Government yards and that which was given out to the contractors. It had been proved that the repairs were done more economically in the Government yards than outside, and the same argument should apply to construction. But even if construction done in Government dockyards did not show a saving over similar work done in private dockyards, it was admitted that it did not cost any more when done in the Government dockyards. Therefore, if there was any preference at all shown in regard to construction it ought to be in favour of the Government dockyards. The amount spent upon work in the Government dockyards was £2,750,000 as compared with £7,827,000 spent upon contract work. But that was only part of the statement, because in addition to that there was material to the extent of £4,816,000 which was also got from contractors. The bulk of this material might easily be produced inside the Government yards.

With regard to the dismissals at the dockyards the number had been estimated at 3,000 who had either been dismissed or were under notice to leave, and this policy was being carried out at a time when the Government had refused to do anything for the unemployed. He assured the Government that this policy would require a good deal of defending to convince working men of the justice of this course. He wished to know how it was that whilst the amount paid in wages had been largely reduced, the amount paid in salaries had increased by £3,677. The rate of wages being paid in the dockyards was lower than the rate paid in private yards, and he contended that the Government should, instead of being a "sweater," set an example to the private employer in the payment of labour. The Secretary to the Admiralty had suggested that to increase the wages would mean an unnecessary addition to the national expenditure of £100,000, whereas the truth of the matter was that the men were being robbed of that amount in wages. It was only when wages were in question that there was any difficulty in finding money. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would give an assurance that the wages of the lower-paid workers would receive consideration this year with a view to their being brought up to a living standard. He called special attention to the condition of labour at Portsmouth and the near prospect of further dismissals from the dockyard. The position there was desperate, and local resources were almost exhausted. The fact that the men had been brought specially to the town to meet the convenience of a Government Department constituted a strong claim for considerate treatment. It should be possible to find employment in the Government yards there and to put an end to the prospect of swelling the ranks of the unemployed at Portsmouth. If that course were not taken he hoped that at any rate the Admiralty would use their influence with the Government to confer additional power upon the local authorities in the direction of finding work for the unemployed.

MR. PRETYMAN said that he would take the opportunity to reply to some of the points raised in the previous debate and which had not been answered at that time. As to the labour question, he pointed out that the Board of Admiralty not only received deputations of workmen but made it a practice to visit the dockyards themselves in order to give the men an opportunity of personally stating their grievances. Such grievances as existed were directly represented to the Admiralty and were considered by them. Moreover, it was the practice of the First Lord of the Admiralty to receive regularly every year a deputation of trade union representatives at the Admiralty, who laid before him and the Board all the points which they desired to raise on behalf of labour.

MR. KEIR HARDIE said his point was that if, when a dispute arose, the Department would see the trade union officials and discuss the points of disagreement they would avoid wasting the time of the Department and secure more amicable settlements.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) asked whether it was the fact that the Committee at present perambulating the dockyards had declined to take evidence with regard to labour grievances.

MR. PRETYMAN said that was the case, because the matter was outside the reference to the Committee. The grievances, where they existed, were represented directly to the Admiralty and considered by them. The position in the dockyards was somewhat different from that in ordinary employment, and it had been held that in view of the possible requirements of national defence it was not desirable that there should be a trade union embracing the whole of the employees in dockyards.

MR. SHACKLETON asked why the Admiralty received a trade union secretary when he accompanied himself and his colleagues, but refused to receive him if he went alone to represent his own union.

MR. PRETYMAN said the Admiralty were perfectly prepared at certain times to receive a deputation and to hear representations on behalf of trade unions generally, but that the workmen who might be responsible for preparing the Navy for the instant action which was necessary in war should all be affiliated with a trade union, which might influence their action at a critical moment, was not a position that the Admiralty could accept.

MR. SHACKLETON: Does the hon. Gentleman mean that workmen in the dockyards are not to be permitted to join a trade union?

MR. PRETYMAN: No.

MR. SHACKLETON: Then what is the object of the observation?

Mr. PRETYMAN said the position was exactly as he had stated it. As to the discharges, he entirely shared the regret that had been expressed. But what was the alternative? Hon. Members opposite were continually urging upon them the necessity for economy, and with perfect justice; but he would ask them by what means it was possible to effect economies without reducing the amount of employment in the dockyards. It happened that the reductions had not arisen simply on the score of economy, but from the new system which had been put in force in the Navy. The system of nucleus crews and the getting rid of ships that were not fit for the first line of battle had greatly reduced the amount of repairs that were necessary. The whole of the repairing work went to the dockyards, but there was not sufficient to employ all the men. It would surely not be seriously suggested that the Admiralty should provide work not required for the Navy at the expense of the taxpayer in order to keep the men employed.

Mr. ARTHUR HENDERSON asked how it was that while wages had been reduced salaries had increased.

Mr. PRETYMAN said that that was not the case.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE suggested that five days a week should be worked until such time as the men could find employment elsewhere.

Mr. PRETYMAN did not think that such a proposal would meet with acceptance in the dockyards. Short time was an excellent system for an interregnum, after which it was expected there would again be full employment. But these economies would be permanent, and there would not be the same amount of work in the dockyards in future. The Admiralty were trying to spread the discharges as far as possible over the summer months when, although doubtless difficult, it was less difficult than in the winter to find other employment. It was very regrettable, but if blame attached to the Admiralty in this matter it was for taking on so many men in the first instance rather than for discharging them now. It was frequently said that the dockyards should be run on business principles. But the custom of private firms was to take on men in accordance with the amount of work they had to do at a particular time, and only yesterday he heard that a firm on the Clyde had only 4,000 men employed at present whereas their normal number was 8,000.

Mr. DALZIEL: There are exceptional circumstances there.

Mr. PRETYMAN doubted whether any employer of labour would say so. But even so, the circumstances of the Admiralty were somewhat exceptional. Unless the House was prepared to vote money out of the Navy funds for work not required for the Navy there was no means of avoiding these discharges. There had been no reduction of wages, and the increase in salaries had been merely the automatic increase.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: Has the official staff been reduced?

Mr. PRETYMAN said there had been no reduction in the department at present.

It might be possible to reduce the salaried staff, but that could not be done until they received the Report on the question of organisation.

The plan of carrying out repairs by the nucleus crews had been tested in the week of the manœuvres which had just taken place. Within the last few days 112 ships in commission in reserve, manned with nucleus crews, had been engaged in manœuvres with the Channel Fleet and two cruiser squadrons, and there had not been a single casualty and not a single breakdown. These ships had been constantly in repair. It was satisfactory to feel that these 112 ships in reserve had been able to go out in a condition to fight, with nucleus crews on board sufficient to man and fight them. There had been no preparation, because no preparation was necessary, and in the case of actual war there would be none of that preparation which called attention to what was being done. Two hundred modern ships, equipped for war, had been round the shores of these islands and nothing had been heard of them. That was a fact which proved the value of the system which had been introduced, and he thought the House would approve of the result.

As to the question of the living wage, he believed that in the dockyards the rate of wages that was being paid was at least equal to the current rate for similar labour in the district. Owing to the congestion in Devonport and other districts rents had been extremely high, and it had been difficult for unskilled labourers receiving £1 or £1 1s. a week to find sufficient accommodation at a reasonable rate. He believed that one result of this reduction of labour, unfortunate as it was in itself, would be to set free a number of houses, relieve the congestion, and so reduce rents. With regard to repairs and construction, he had little to add to what he said in Committee. All repairs went to the dockyards. There was no intention to take construction from the dockyards, but only to maintain the present policy of a fair and reasonable division of the work of new construction as between the dockyards and the private yards.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said the hon. Gentleman had now admitted, he believed for the first time, that the rental conditions in some of those districts were exceptional, and to say that a reduction might be looked for as a result of the system of discharges now going on was a poor way of looking at the question. The duty of the Government was to ascertain what those exceptional conditions really were, and to pay such wages as would enable the men to cope with them. The example of the Home Office with reference to the Metropolitan Police was one to be followed in this respect. As to the reception of trade union deputations by the Admiralty, it did not take place every year; sometimes five years elapsed before such a deputation was received, so that it was hardly fair for the hon. Gentleman to represent that it was the regular practice of the Admiralty to receive trade union deputations. The proper course would be to have a trades council of the men who could come face to face with the Admiralty from time to time.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON rose to continue the debate.

Mr. PRETYMAN rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: After wasting two hours! This is what we get for coming to look after the workmen's interests!

While the House was being cleared for a division,

MR. KEIR HARDIE, seated, and with his hat on, submitted, as a point of order, that he had at ten minutes past ten moved the closure on one item of this Vote, which had been refused. Now, after forty minutes' discussion on the entire Vote, the closure was moved and accepted. Was that in accordance with the usual custom under which the closure was granted?

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member was incorrect in saying that he moved the closure on one item—the reduction moved had opened up all the subjects of the Vote. Upon the reduction which was moved, any of the matters that were relevant to this Vote could have been discussed, and a great number of them were discussed.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 114; Noes, 76. (Division List No. 278.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manc'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Rt. Hn. Ailwyn Edw.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Rt. Hn Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick SW.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir James (Staffords. NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt. Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Baker, Joseph Allen
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Buxton, N. E (York, NR, Whitby
Caldwell, James
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, J. M. F.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hayden, John Patrick
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Lamont, Norman
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Levy, Maurice
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Shackleton and Mr. Arthur Henderson.

Question put accordingly, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

The House divided:—Ayes, 115; Noes, 74. (Division List No. 279.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon, A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Rt Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Rt Hn Sir R B (Inv'r'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

Gordon, Hn.J.E. (Elgin&Nairn
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, SirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John(KentFaversham
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S,
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Morgan,David J(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Reid, James Greenock)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Baker, Joseph Allen
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Buxton,N.E.(York,NR,Whitby
Caldwell, James
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Findlay,Alexander(Lanark,NE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn HerbertJohn
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hardie, J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Hayden, John Patrick
Higham, John Sharp
Hutchinson, Dr.Charles Fredk.
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Lamont, Norman
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halfiax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Second and Third Resolutions to be further considered to-morrow.

TRADE MARKS (RECOMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee; Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) asked the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury whether, in the arrangement of public business, it was possible for him to influence the Prime Minister in the direction of pushing forward the Unemployed Bill. The representatives of organised labour had given and were prepared to give every possible assistance to secure the passage of the measure. They had not forgotten the acute suffering of last winter, and when the Government introduced their Bill they were exceedingly hopeful that it would be passed so that it might come into operation in the ensuing winter. It could not be said that Labour Members were responsible for any waste of time. The Gentlemen who obeyed the behests of the Prime Minister and the Government Whips had between them wasted more time during the present session than would have sufficed to carry this Bill through all its stages. The Bill passed its Second Reading by the largest majority any measure had secured during his three years of Parliamentary life; it was earnestly desired by the organised workers of the country; and he appealed to the Government not to allow matters to drift on to the end of the session without an effort being made to place the measure on the Statute-book.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) assured the House that this was no mere idle protest; it was serious business. What was the position? The present Secretary for Ireland, impressed by his experiences of last winter, persuaded the Government to bring in a Bill. Every Labour Member supported the Bill, not because they thought it went far enough, but because at any rate it settled the principle that the nation had some responsibility towards the unemployed of the country. They were anxious that the measure should pass, but other proposals, certainly of less importance to the workmen, had been placed in front of it. The present protest was made with a deep sense of responsibility. The 12th of August was nothing to the Labour Members; they were prepared, if necessary, to sit to September 12th to carry the Bill; they feared to meet the coming winter unless some machinery were in force to deal with the suffering which would inevitably arise. Even now, in the summer-time, thousands of men, willing to work, were unable to find employment. Were the Government prepared to sit quietly down, and leave to labour leaders the responsibility of facing the situation? He wanted no riots or breaches of the peace; he would do all he could to dissuade the men from taking that course, as he had done in reference to marches to London; but he appealed to the Government not to put too much on them.

MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside), while not endorsing all that had been said, cordially supported the main object of the appeal. Many supporters of the Government felt very strongly on the matter, and he hoped the Prime Minister would find time to carry the measure through.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) associated his colleagues and himself with the appeal which had been made, His object in rising was to make a practical proposal, which would not in any way hinder the programme of the Government with regard to the Redistribution proposals. The Prime Minister had announced that Friday would be given to the Scotch Education Bill. Personally, he was in favour of that measure, and would be glad to see it passed into law, but before a day was devoted to it an assurance should be given that it was intended to place it on the Statute-book, otherwise the day given would be a pure waste of time. Inasmuch as it was perfectly well known that the Government did not intend to carry that Bill, he thought that Labour Members had sound ground for complaint in the fact that there would be a day wasted which would be probably sufficient to dispose of the next stage of the Unemployed Bill. Further, if necessary, he thought the public spirit of the House should be called upon for a Saturday sitting. Personally, he was as constantly in attendance as the Chief Whip opposite himself, and his Saturdays were very precious, but he and his colleagues would gladly give up their Saturday's rest to see this Bill put through. It would be seen that these suggestions would not in any way affect the Redistribution proposals; they were made solely in the interests of the Unemployed Bill. Upon the merits of that measure he would say nothing; it seemed a very poor and inadequate attempt to deal with the question, but it was something, and in these matters he deferred to the opinion of the labour representatives. They considered the Bill of some value, and taking that view from them, he most earnestly joined in the appeal which had been made, and hoped the right hon. Gentleman would convey to the Prime Minister the suggestions he had made.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) pointed out that the only obstruction to the Bill came from half-a-dozen Members on the Government side of the House. If the Patronage Secretary would use his influence with those Gentlemen everything else would be easy, and the Bill would have a swift passage through its various stages. He joined in the appeal, and cordially supported the suggestion of the hon. Member for Waterford.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) hoped that in any re-arrangement of business the Government would bear in mind the absolute necessity of passing the Scotch Churches Bill, which was of infinitely more importance at present than the Education Bill. If necessary, he would suggest that the ecclesiastical measure should be taken on Friday.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington) said he could only promise to convey to the Prime Minister the substance of what had been said. He was afraid that hon. Members overrated his influence with Gentlemen on his own side of the House. He much appreciated the temperate and earnest way in which hon. Members had spoken, and he would certainly acquaint the Prime Minister with what had passed, but it must be clearly understood that he could not undertake that there should be any departure from the programme of business already announced.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said the Bill was not opposed on the Opposition side of the House at all, and if the right hon. Gentleman's influence prevailed with the supporters of the Government there would be no difficulty whatever in getting the Bill through.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 13th July, 1905.

VISCOUNT HAWARDEN.

Petition of Robert Henry Maude, Viscount Hawarden in the Peerage of Ireland, claiming a right to vote at the election of Representative Peers for Ireland; read, and referred to the Lord Chancellor to consider and report thereupon to the House.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Rhondda Urban District Council Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Denman be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Earl of Craven; read, and agreed to.

Rotherham, Maltby, and Laughton Railway Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Midland Railway Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

South Barracas (Buenos Ayres) Gas and Coke Company Bill [H.L.]. Committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 26th of June and the 4th instant discharged, and Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill; Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 1) Bill. To be read 3^{a} on Monday next.

Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

London County Council (Tramways) Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; and referred to the Examiners.

Hessle Gas Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Bolton Corporation Bill; Wemyss Dock Bill [H.L.]; North-Eastern Railway Bill; North-Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Ravensworth and the Lord Hindlip be proposed to the House as members of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Craven and the Lord Clinton; read, and agreed to.

North-Eastern Railway Bill; North-Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Ludlow be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Duke of Northumberland, and that the Lord Ludlow be Chairman of the said Committee; read, and agreed to.

Glasgow Corporation (Tramways Consolidation) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Glasgow Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. To be read 2^{a} To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3434. Argentine Republic.

No. 3435. China (Foochow).

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Thirty-third Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1903–1904. Supplement containing the report of the medical officer for 1903–1904.

ARMY (VOLUNTEERS).

Circular letter addressed to General Officers Commanding-in-Chief in substitution for the circular letter of 20th June, 1905.

NORTH SEA FISHERIES INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE.

Report on fishery and hydrographical investigations in the North Sea and adjacent waters, 1902–1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

EXCHEQUER AND AUDIT DEPARTMENTS ACT, 1886.

Treasury Minute, dated 10th July, 1905, requiring that the Comptroller and Auditor-General shall extend his audit of the accounts of the Crown Agents for the Colonies, hitherto restricted to the office fund, and shall verify the quarterly certificates of cash and securities held by them in trust for the Colonies.

RULES PUBLICATION ACT, 1893.

No. 220. Additional Rule.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

COAL MINES (WEIGHING OF MINERALS) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, this is a non-contentious measure which has come up from the other House and which deals with the weighing of coal. As the House is probably aware, under an Act passed when my noble friend Viscount Cross was Home Secretary, the men were given power to obtain an official of their own for the purpose of weighing the coal. This Bill provides, among other things, for the appointment of a deputy official of this character, who is known as a check-weigher; it provides the method of electing this official, and there is a provision imposing on the employers the necessity of giving him shelter and facilities. The Bill also provides for the removal of the check-weigher by ballot, and regulates the persons who are to contribute to his wages. The Bill is the result of negotiations between representatives of the masters and men, and everything of a contentious character has been eliminated. I believe no debate took place upon it in the other House, and I hope the Second Reading will be assented to without opposition.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Newton.*)

LORD BELPER: My Lords, the noble Lord is correct in stating that this is a non-contentious Bill. It has been agreed to by both masters and men, and His Majesty's Government give a general approval to its provisions.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

PUBLIC MEETINGS (FACILITIES) BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow.

DISSEMINATION OF NEWS IN WAR TIME.

*__LORD ELLENBOROUGH__ rose "To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, considering the fact that we expend millions of pounds every year on the maintenance of cavalry for land service, and scouts and cruisers for sea service, whose chief business during war would be to ascertain what the enemy may be doing, it is not desirable to consider the question of our having to undergo some national inconvenience as regards the dissemination of news, in case of war or grave emergency, for the purpose of concealing our own warlike proceedings; and whether, considering the success that has hitherto attended the Japanese system of keeping secret the movements of their land forces, and the state and condition and whereabouts of their fleets, he will cause the laws and proclamations of Japan, bearing on the subject of dissemination of news, to be translated and presented to both Houses of Parliament, together with some other documents on this subject, so as to enable the public in general to study the question as to whether our laws require alteration."

The noble Lord said: My Lords, I much regret the absence of the First Lord of the Admiralty, and not only his absence but the cause of it. I hope that his health may soon be restored. I have put this Question off for six weeks in the hope that he would be present when it was discussed. But in the public interest I do not think that there should be any further delay in the study of this matter. If we are ever engaged in a war with a great Continental Power, the importance of the questions to which I am about to refer will only be equalled by the difficulty of dealing with them. Therefore, I think that they deserve careful study in time of peace.

The Times of the 23rd of May of this year mentions a number of cases in which information was conveyed by British newspapers to an enemy who made full use of the knowledge thus obtained. For instance, in September, 1805, a month before the battle of Trafalgar, Nelson wrote to the Governor of Gibraltar requesting him to prevent the publisher of the *Gibraltar Gazette* mentioning the strength of his Fleet. He had good reason for so doing. Three months previously, on the 10th June, *The Times* had stated that Nelson had but ten ships with him when he crossed the Atlantic in search of Villeneuve's Toulon Fleet, and that the "Royal Sovereign" had been left behind at Ferrol because she sailed badly. I can scarcely imagine anything more likely to defeat Nelson's plans than the publication of such news. The Duke of Wellington also frequently complained of the information furnished to the French by the British newspapers. His complaints were well grounded. Berthier, the chief of the Emperor's staff, wrote to Masséna—

> "We have the most perfect information from the English and much better than that possessed by you. The Emperor reads the English newspapers and a great number of letters written by the Opposition, some of which censure Lord Wellington and speak in detail of your operations."

On the 7th of November, 1810, Napoleon wrote—

> "We have news of the Army of Portugal up to the 16th. It comes from the English newspapers, who say that the two armies were facing one another on the 15th, five leagues from Lisbon."

On the 7th of May, 1811, Napoleon wrote—

> "I send you the translation of the English newspapers. You will see that on the 18th of April Wellington had passed the Tagus. Have these despatches copied and sent to the Dukes of Istria and Ragusa, and to General Belliard."

On the 15th of August, 1810, during the siege of Cadiz, Wellington complained—

> "That he had seen in the English newspapers an accurate account of the batteries and works erecting at Cadiz and on the Isla, with the number of guns each was to contain; their calibre, their distance from each other, and from the enemy's works."

This complaint does not appear to have had much effect, for he repeated it to Lord Liverpool in January, 1811.

In those days news from Cadiz would have had to come to England in a sailing vessel, to travel in a postchaise to London, and then when printed to go by postchaise to the sea coast, cross the Channel in a sailing vessel, and then go by postchaise or courier to Cadiz. So that three or four weeks would elapse before such news could reach the army opposed to us, and by that time it would have lost a great deal of its freshness and its value. Whereas at present the contents of the London papers would have been known to the besiegers of Cadiz twelve hours after they had been published.

Admiral Sir Cyprian Bridge, who has held the appointments of Director of the Naval Intelligence Department and Commander-in-Chief on the Chinese and Japanese Station, wrote quite recently in *Brassey's Naval Annual*—

> "If we have no other lesson to learn from the war, we have at least that of the value of reticence given us by the Japanese. Never has the lesson been more needed. When two nations, each endowed with a newspaper Press and habituated to the perusal of the journals

of other countries, go to war, the objections to the publication of intelligence relating to an operation in progress are serious. The Japanese, and in a less degree the Russians, have shown us that concealment is possible. No officer should need to be told that it is wise."

Admiral The Hon. Sir Edmund Fremantle wrote as follows in the July number of the *Navy League Journal*—

> "At the time of the Dogger Bank incident the whole world was promptly informed that our Home Fleet was in the Orkneys, our armoured cruiser squadron under refit, many of the ships being in dock, and that the Mediterranean squadron was in the North Atlantic."

He went on to say—

> "It is certain that no censorship would be possible, and that no hurried Act of Parliament or Government action not well considered beforehand would be satisfactory. If the Government have not sufficient information at their disposal, the question should be submitted without delay to a small Committee or Royal Commission, and a Bill brought in next session to deal with the matter."

I hope that the Government may find themselves able to act in accordance with Admiral Fremantle's suggestion.

I may add that I have lately discussed a number of questions with naval officers and find that though they differ considerably on such points as the usefulness of different classes of ships, and on matters connected with armaments, yet on this question they are unanimous. They think that news of the movements or proceedings of either ships, officers, or men should never be allowed to reach either an enemy or a Power that may become an enemy in the course of a few days. The opinions of the men who will have to fight our ships until they sink deserve some consideration from their fellow-countrymen. Our soldiers and sailors are ready to take all ordinary risks of war. But they are not mere gladiators fighting for the sake of lookers-on. When this country is at war, the whole of it is at war; and civilians must be prepared to undergo some annoyances besides having to pay taxes, if by so doing they can lessen the risks of those who are fighting for them.

When the Russian squadron left Vladivostock in August last the news of its departure came in some unknown way to Europe, and was published in the London dailies. This was, of course, telegraphed to Japan without delay, and in consequence of this Admiral Kaminura was able to intercept and defeat the Russian cruisers. Surely we do not wish to wait until similar disasters happen to us before we take steps to prevent them. Most of the Japanese movements, whether by land or by sea, appear to be unexpected. If when in a state of emergency, before the war actually commenced, the Japanese journals had published the news that their fleet had sailed, and that troops had been embarked on February 6th, it would have been telegraphed to Port Arthur, and the surprise of the Russian Fleet on the 8th of that month could never have taken place. The same element of surprise appears to form part of all Japanese schemes, and was notably most successful at Mukden, and at the battle of Tsusima. No one ever knew where Togo was, or what was the strength of his fleet. Whether off Port Arthur or Tsusima, he had a knack of appearing in force in unexpected places.

Lord Ellenborough.

As both Great Britain and Japan are groups of islands, their safety depends on much the same considerations, and as the Japanese Press and Telegraph Laws, backed by Japanese patriotism, have hitherto succeeded in their object, it is quite possible that some of their legislation may be suited to us also. At the same time, as I do not yet know what the Japanese laws are, I hope that I may not be represented as desiring that their laws should be adopted by this country in their entirety. Doubtless they will require some modification. I would point out, however, that though their war news is not published in full, the Japanese are in the habit of freely criticising their generals. Of one of them, whose troops had failed to capture an important position, a Japanese wrote:

> "That if the general had not got a weapon of his own with which to commit suicide, there was a sharp sword hanging on a nail in the editorial office which was quite at his disposal."

I have the greatest respect for the general referred to. I do not at all approve of this grim style of criticism, but I quote it to show that checking the publication of news is no bar to freedom of comment.

No legislation on this subject is possible without the support of the Press, and I hope that some more of our periodicals will follow the example of *The Times*, *Morning Post*, and the *Globe*, and declare their intention of supporting a movement in favour of the solution of these problems. Most writers and public speakers have read military histories; those who have not done so have probably read military novels or short stories in magazines, the plot of which frequently turns upon the keeping or divulging a secret in war time. And even those who never read anything must have been occasionally to plays in which the principal actress appears in the part of a lovely and designing lady, a spy, in the pay of a foreign Government, who endeavours to obtain the secret documents that have been entrusted to the care of her lover. Therefore, I think, it quite possible that the value of secrecy in war time could easily be brought home to the majority of our Parliamentary voters, that they only want a lead, and that they may consent before very long to pass a well-considered and carefully drawn-up Bill, which could lie dormant until a time of war or great emergency.

The House of Commons and the country have for years approved of our spending millions on cruisers, scouts, and cavalry, who are the eyes and ears of an Army, and smaller sums on Intelligence Departments for the purpose of discovering the movements of an enemy. In face of this it is most illogical to make no attempt to conceal our own proceedings. If we persist in gratifying our very natural anxiety to know of all the steps leading up to a battle, we may get a wrong result. We may have to suffer defeat instead of obtaining a victory. Some of the laws of other nations may be worth studying, but if they were all printed they would form a Blue-book of portentous size. Selection is, I think, of more importance than bulk. On the 3rd of March, Lord Selborne, in this House, in answer to a Question of mine, put the necessity for the study of this subject in the clearest possible language, and I would suggest to the Government, if they accept my proposition, that that portion of Lord Selborne's speech which referred to the dissemination of news should be published in the Blue-book, together with any other documents of importance which may affect these questions.

What I am most afraid of is that this problem may be neglected until we have suffered some serious disaster, and that ten days later some crude and ineffective Act may be passed which will not only fail to secure its object, but will cause unnecessary annoyance. Therefore, I hope that the Government may see its way to adopt Admiral Sir Edmund Fremantle's suggestion—namely, that a small Committee or Royal Commission be appointed to take evidence and report on the subject so as to prepare the ground for legislation in 1906. They should have power to hear evidence with closed doors and in public, and to report publicly as well as confidentially. At the same time I wish it to be distinctly understood that I consider that the translation and the publication of the documents to which I have referred should not be taken as committing the Government to any particular policy or legislation. I beg to ask the Question standing in my name.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (The Marquess of LINLITHGOW): My Lords, in reply to the noble Lord I have to state that the Admiralty are not in possession of any Japanese regulations on the subject of the dissemination of news, but the important question of control over the issue of news in time of war is engaging the attention of His Majesty's Government.

THE IVEAGH-PIRRIE MOTOR-CAR SCHEME.

LORD KILLANIN rose "To ask His Majesty's Government whether any steps were being taken to bring into operation in Ireland the transit scheme known as the Iveagh-Pirrie Motor-Car Service: and to call attention to the local interest taken in the projected route from Galway to Costello." The noble Lord said: My Lords, in putting to His Majesty's Government the Question standing in my name I should like to make one or two explanatory remarks. More than two years have elapsed since the then Chief Secretary for Ireland announced in another place that Lord Iveagh and

Mr. Pirrie had expressed their willingness to spend a very considerable sum of money in establishing and financing as a running concern a service of motor-cars in out-of-the-way parts of Ireland where facilities of transit are very much needed, and this extremely generous and public-spirited action on the part of these two remarkable Irishmen was very well received in Ireland, and awakened widespread interest throughout the country. But, as I have said, it is two years since this announcement was made, and I desire to-day to ask what steps are being taken to carry the scheme into operation.

I am fairly familiar with what occurred last year. Lord Iveagh and Mr. Pirrie appointed a Commission to investigate as to suitable routes on which to run these motor-cars. They were given every assistance by Irish Public Departments. Local councils instructed their officials to give them every information, and they finally decided, I understand, to try the service on seventeen routes. Last year the then Chief Secretary for Ireland was very keen about it, and did a great deal to remove difficulties that had arisen in inaugurating the service. The present Chief Secretary has lately visited the West of Ireland, and now that he has become acquainted with the necessity for facilities of transit in these out-of-the-way parts of the country I hope he will attend to the matter, and see if this motor-car service cannot be brought into operation. I would also like to draw attention to one route with which I am more particularly familiar, on account of living in that district. It is one of the seventeen routes that were recommended, and it is in a part of Ireland which is more in need of these facilities, perhaps, than any other. It is very remote, but very populous; it is also a very poor district where the people have the greatest difficulty in getting what they require, and where they have no convenience for exporting what their labour produces. As evidence of the great interest that was taken in the scheme there, I would mention that the Galway County Council and District Council voted £1,750 for the purpose of putting the roads in repair. Anyone familiar with the county councils in Ireland, and with the poverty of the districts there, will bear me out when I say that that was very strong evidence of the practical interest of the people in making this concern a success.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, I am sure there is no one in your Lordships' House more competent to put forward the requirements of county Galway than my noble friend, whose name, through the good deeds of his late lamented father, is a household word in that county. I am, therefore, only too glad to answer any Question which my noble friend may put to me. Reference was made by the noble Lord to the debate that took place in the other House rather more than a year ago, in which my right hon. friend the then Chief Secretary for Ireland dwelt at considerable length on the proposal made by those two patriotic and highly-respected Irishmen, Lord Iveagh and Mr Pirrie, with regard to the creation of a motor-car service in certain parts of the country. The Chief Secretary stated that there were no less than seventeen routes selected which they considered would be benefited by this motor-car service. These routes were surveyed and investigated, at the request of Lord Iveagh and Mr. Pirrie, by the Irish Government, who gave them, so far as they could, their cordial support in the philanthropic and useful scheme which they were propounding; and included in those seventeen routes was the route between Galway and Costello. But when the scheme was put forward there was this contingency, that the roads should be put in such a condition that the cars could travel over them with safety; and when I tell your Lordships that the motor engine of these cars weighs four tons and the trailer one and a-half tons it will be readily recognised that it was necessary that the roads should be put in order. Several county councils approved of the scheme, and amongst them was the county council to which my noble friend alluded. The county councils approved of the proposed experimental service, but declined the expenditure that was necessary to put the roads into proper condition. My noble friend is quite right in stating that the county council of Galway did more, perhaps, than the other county councils in the matter, for I find that they made a suggestion that the share of the county in the unexpended balances of the Exchequer contribution for labourers' cottages should be placed at the disposal of the council for the relief of the expenditure on roads for this service. The Irish Government favourably considered this suggestion, and proposed an Amendment to the now defunct Labourers Bill of 1904 which gave effect to that proposal. Therefore, my noble friend will see that, so far as lay in their power, His Majesty's Irish Executive gave assistance to that council, of which he is a member, and would have been glad to see the proposed scheme carried into effect. But no further steps, so far as I can gather, seem to have been taken by the various county councils in the promotion of this very philanthropic and excellent scheme. Indeed, I believe that Lord Iveagh and Mr. Pirrie announced that they would allow a year to go by in order to see what could be done, and whether the proposed scheme would receive that consideration at the hands of the various county councils which they thought it should receive, if necessary, a rate being levied to meet the expenditure incurred.

I cannot but think that unless the county councils within whose jurisdiction these seventeen routes come act as a whole the scheme must fall through, for, philanthropic as these gentlemen are, they cannot be asked to supply motor-cars for only a few of the routes instead of for the whole of the system which they had thought out, surveyed, and investigated. I would remind my noble friend that, however much the Irish Executive sympathise with the idea of this motor-car service, developing as it would certain remote parts of Ireland and giving opportunities for the transport of the produce of that part of the country, they have nothing whatever to do with this scheme beyond according it, if I may use the expression, a paternal interest, and giving its promoters every assistance in their power. We should be glad to see the county councils act as we had hoped they would act when this scheme was first inaugurated by putting their roads in order, for we feel sure that if the scheme were taken up it would be of enormous benefit to the country as a whole, and especially to that part with which my noble friend is so intimately connected.

THE SEIZURE OF BRITISH VESSELS.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to ask the Question standing in my name—viz.: "Whether, in regard to the claims for compensation lodged by His Majesty's Government for the seizure, detention, and destruction of British merchant vessels by Russian men-of-war, the claims of the captains, officers, and crews of these merchant vessels for personal suffering and loss have been included; and whether, considering the length of time which has elapsed since several British vessels were seized or sunk, there is a probability of an early settlement of these claims being effected."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I am able to inform the noble Lord that in nearly all of the cases in which claims have been put forward for compensation on account of the seizure, detention, and destruction of British merchant vessels by Russian men-of-war an amount has been included for the claims of the captains, officers, and crews of those vessels. That is certainly true of those cases which have attracted most public attention. For example, in the case of the "Knight Commander" a claim has been made for the loss of the effects of the captain, officers, and crew, and for compensation. In the case of the "Hipsang" a considerable sum has been claimed for the same purpose So also in the case of the "Ardova," which was only detained for eight days. Even in that case a sum has been asked for on account of certain men who were compulsorily paid off at Suez. In the case of the "Malacca" we believe that the lump sum claimed by the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company is intended to cover all claims of the kind to which the noble Lord refers. In the case of the "Calchas" we have only just received the judgment of the Prize Court, nd the claim has not yet been made out. In the case of the "Allanton" the claims of the crew have been put forward by the Sailors' and Firemen's Union, and an inquiry is being made into their claims.

Then the noble Lord calls attention to the length of time that has elapsed since these British vessels were seized, and asks whether there is a probability of an early settlement of the claims being effected. The settlement of these claims is necessarily a matter which takes a considerable time, in the first place, because it is essential that in these cases the claimants should exhaust their legal remedies, and that, I need not remind the noble Lord, means that they have to appeal first to the Prize Court, and then to the Supreme Court, which hears cases on appeal from the Court below. As in most of these cases the seizure took place in the China Seas, and as the Prize Court is held at Vladivostok, there has obviously been a very considerable amount of delay. Besides that, it is essential that in all these cases, before a claim is put forward by His Majesty's Government, the particulars of the claim should be carefully considered and sifted; and I am told that even in cases where claims have been put forward before a Prize Court in this country the delay is always appreciable. But it is not the case that nothing has been accomplished in the way of settlement of these claims. For example, in the case of the "Calchas" the Russian Government have already paid the value of the flour on board. In the case of the "Frankby" the owners have received the greater part of their claim. In the case of the "Ettrickdale" there has been payment in full, and the case is closed. In the case of the "Foxton Hall" 80 per cent. of the amount claimed has been paid, and ve understand that the owner is satisfied. If there are any other cases in regard to which the noble Lord desires information, I need not say that I shall be glad to give it to him.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH: I should like to ask the noble Marquess whether it is not the fact that in a great many cases the captures were made, not by regular men-of-war, but by vessels of the Volunteer Navy, which, according to the laws of war, are not authorised to make captures at all, and which formerly would have been regarded as pirates?

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am afraid I cannot answer that Question offhand; but it is the case, as we all know, that some of these seizures were made by vessels belonging to the Russian Volunteer Fleet.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH: May I ask the noble Marquess whether any representation has been made on the subject?

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Certainly.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I should like to call the noble Marquess's attention to a case which he will recollect well. One of these Volunteer cruisers—the "Dnieper"—on her retreat after the battle of Tsu Shima sunk a British vessel and took the crew on board. The crew have, I understand, been recently released at Suez. Can the noble Marquess give information as to any proceedings that have taken place in regard to this matter.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: It would be better that the noble Earl should put the Question on the Paper. The matter is very technical, and I should like to be exactly accurate as to details.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

*LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: My Lords, I rise to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will place on the Table of the House any communications that have passed between the Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia and His Majesty's Government on the subject of marriages in Australia with a deceased wife's sister; and whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps to effect any alteration in the law affecting that subject.

My object in putting this Question to the noble Marquess is to call the attention of His Majesty's Government to the importance of the matter to which the Question refers. A Bill legalising in this country marriages which have taken place in the self-governing Colonies with a deceased wife's sister has lately been before your Lordships' House on two occasions. It was introduced for the purpose of remedying what is undoubtedly a great anomaly in our law. I will not enter into the merits of that Bill; but its object was to secure that the children of these marriages, effected by virtue of colonial laws sanctioned by this country, should not be illegitimate in this country in respect to the holding of freehold property. In 1898 a Bill with this object was carried through your Lordships' House by a majority of nearly three to one, and on the second occasion when it was introduced it was carried by a large majority. So far, the opinion of this House is strongly in favour of this measure. It was stated in 1898 that sixteen of the self-governing Colonies had passed this law, and now I understand the remaining self-governing Colony has accepted it. In 1896 every Agent of every Colony was instructed by his Government to appeal collectively to the Imperial Government to urge that this anomaly should be removed. Again, when the Prime Ministers came over in 1897 they appealed collectively to the Colonial Office to redress this great wrong.

I am not aware whether there is any Parliamentary Paper on the subject, but I understand that Lord Northcote, on behalf of the Australian Commonwealth, has addressed a serious remonstrance to the Government, pointing out the strong feeling in the Colonies on the subject, and I am also aware that the Colonial Secretary has sent a sympathetic reply to that letter. I have every reason to know that the noble Marquess the Leader of this House is in favour of passing a Bill which should remedy the anomaly to which I have referred, and in 1898 he voted in favour of the measure introduced for that purpose. I do not doubt but that His Majesty's Government, as a whole, wish to remedy this defect, but the question is, When is it to be done? This is surely not the time when we should thwart a strong desire on the part of the Colonies. A refusal to remedy, even a delay in remedying, this injustice may do a great deal of evil. I appeal to politicians of every class that it would be a wise and statesmanlike thing to pass a Bill which would remedy this grievance by providing that marriages between persons of British race which are valid according to the laws of that part of the Empire in which they were celebrated should be considered equally valid in the United Kingdom.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, Lord Northcote's letter, to which my noble and learned friend refers, as well as the reply of the Colonial Secretary thereto, were presented to Parliament in the month of April of this year. The document is, therefore, within the reach of my noble and learned friend.

*LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: Yes, but is there no other communication besides these two?

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am not aware of any. The despatch from the Governor-General contained in this Parliamentary Paper is undoubtedly the letter which my noble and learned friend had in his mind.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: There has been nothing since Mr. Lyttelton's reply.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I have not heard of anything. My noble and learned friend asks whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to take any steps to effect an alteration in the law on this subject. It must be obvious to your Lordships that it would be impossible for us at this stage of the session to attempt legislation upon so controversial a subject; and I am afraid I cannot take upon myself to inform the House as to the manner in which the question is likely to be dealt with in any future session of Parliament. The noble and learned Lord reminds me that I voted in favour of the Bill. That is perfectly true, and, personally, I have not altered the opinion which I then entertained; but when the noble and learned Lord goes on to suggest that His Majesty's Government as a whole are probably in sympathy with the proposal, I must remind him that His Majesty's Government as a whole have never committed themselves in any way with regard to this question; and I think it is an open secret that within our ranks there is a very considerable divergence of opinion on the question. I am afraid that in these circumstances I cannot enlighten my noble and learned friend as to the prospect of legislation.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: I can quite understand that late in the session it would be very difficult to pass a Bill dealing with this subject. But may I remind the noble Marquess that these Papers were laid on the Table in April, and that a letter was sent on December 30th last year informing the Australian Ministers that their suggestion should receive the most careful consideration of His Majesty's Government. Nothing, apparently, has since been done.

THE EARL OF RANFURLY: My Lords, I should like to point out that the law legalising the marriages in question has already received His Majesty's sanction as regards the Colonies. In these circumstances I think the question of the rights of the children of such marriages should receive immediate consideration. I may inform your Lordships that the present anomaly is seriously regarded in the Colonies, and the earliest opportunity should be taken to remove the existing conflict between British and colonial law in this respect.

BRITISH TRADERS IN THE MARSHALL AND CAROLINE ISLANDS.

THE EARL OF JERSEY rose "To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he was able to give further information concerning the negotiations with the German Government with respect to trade in the Marshall and Caroline groups of islands." The noble Earl said: My Lords, it will be within the recollection of the House that when this matter was last brought forward the noble Marquess was able to give a friendly and satisfactory answer from the German Government so far as its terms went. I should be glad to know if any further progress has been made. There are two main points. The first is compensation for damages, and on that I would ask the noble Marquess whether any advance has been made towards a settlement. The other point is, what will be the position of British trade in the Pacific after October 1st? At the present time British traders are shut out from the Marshall Islands, whilst German traders trade freely with islands within the British group. German traders have been going round the German Islands and securing, for export exclusively in German ships, the trade of these islands, so it is very important that British traders should know what their exact position will be after next October. It is quite possible that steps will be taken in the interval which will bar British traders from the benefits of free and equal trade in these islands as arranged under treaty. The noble Marquess said on the last occasion that the German Government considered this a matter of trivial importance, and therefore not one on which the two nations should have a quarrel. That is perfectly true; and, therefore, I should be glad if the noble Marquess could persuade the German Government that though the matter may not now have created strong feeling, yet, if delay continues, it is quite possible that very acute feeling will be created in Australia upon the matter, which we should all deplore. I hope the noble Marquess will be in a position to say that some further advance has been made towards a settlement of this question.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I cannot add very much to the statement which I made on this subject on a former occasion. I may, however, tell my noble friend that we are in correspondence with the German Government in regard to the several points which arise out of the termination of the monopoly of the Jaluit Company in the Marshall Islands. Among those points are, I think, most of those to which he specially referred. We have desired our Ambassador in Berlin to obtain information as to the conditions under which land can be acquired with a view to securing domicile for trading purposes. The question arises whether the existing rule does not virtually prevent foreigners from obtaining domicile. We have also instructed Sir

F. Lascelles to ask whether the British firms which have been excluded from trade in the islands will after October 1st, when the monopoly terminates, be able to resume operations without unreasonable restrictions. We have also called the attention of the German Government to the alleged German monopoly in the Caroline Islands. We are under the impression that the prohibition of trade there is not absolute, and that it is probably the result of unauthorised provisions imposed locally without the knowledge of the superior authorities. My noble friend refers to the question of compensation. We have intimated to the German Government that the question of compensation has been raised, and that it will have to be considered. We have not yet received replies to these inquiries. Indeed, I think there has scarcely been time, making allowance for the ordinary delays of official correspondence. I can only add that we are quite aware that a very strong feeling on this subject exists in the Australian Colonies, and that we shall not fail to bring to the notice of the German Government the fact that that strong feeling exists.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Five o'clock, till To morrow, a quarter-past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 13*th July*, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Tees Valley Water Board Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Whitby Urban District Council Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time to-morrow.

Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment (Vincent Square) Bill. Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment (Vincent Square) Bill with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).

Sir ALEXANDER HARGREAVES BROWN reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills; That the parties opposing the Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords] had stated that the evidence of Captain J. Whitley Dixon, R.N., was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Captain J. Whitley Dixon do attend the said Committee to-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That Captain J. Whitley Dixon do attend the Committee on Group L of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill [Lords]; Workington Harbour and Dock Bill [Lords]; Shepton Mallet Gas Company (Electric Lighting) Bill [Lords]; South Lancashire Tramways Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Acton District) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Formby Township Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Agricultural Rates Act, 1896, etc., Continuance Bill; Millport Piers and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill, without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Bradford Corporation Tramways, Gorton Urban District Council Tramways, Keighley Corporation Tramways, Leeds Corporation Tramways, Liverpool Corporation Tramways Extensions, and Pudsey Corporation Tramways." [Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords.]

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 272.]

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNTY OF LONDON AND DISTRICT ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY BILL.

Mr. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn) asked leave to withdraw the Resolution he had on the Paper to commit this Bill to a Select Committee of nine, the present order of committal to be discharged. He said he took this course in view of the fact that the Committee had already commenced its inquiry.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, S.) said he had a similar Motion on the Blue Paper, and wished to move it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not down by Order, and could not, therefore, be moved to-day.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): As the hon. Member had not withdrawn his Motion, it ought to have been put down. Whose fault was it it was not?

Mr. SPEAKER said he would inquire.

Mr. LOUGH: I propose to move it.

Mr. SPEAKER: On Monday.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NORTH SEA FISHERIES INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE.

Copy presented, of Report on Fishery and Hydrographical Investigations in the North Sea and Adjacent Waters, 1902–3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CROWN AGENTS.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 10th July, 1905, requiring the Comptroller and Auditor-General to extend his audit of the Accounts of the Crown Agents for the Colonies, hitherto restricted to the Office Fund, and to verify the Quarterly Certificates of Cash and Securities held by them in trust for the Colonies [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Naval Barrack Theatres.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state the number of theatres open to the public within the walls of barracks in the United Kingdom, and whether such theatres are controlled by the commanding officers; and, if so, under what regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The theatres within the barracks at Eastney, Chatham, Portsmouth, Plymouth, and Deal form part of the recreation buildings provided for the use of the Royal Marines, and are under the control of the officer commanding the barracks. These theatres are regulated under Section 174 (a) of The Army Act, 1881, and are not open to the public except that there is nothing to prevent the men introducing civilian friends to a limited extent. The naval barracks have no theatres, but they have a stage in their canteens for sing-song performances.

Fines in the Sasine Office, Edinburgh.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.): To ask the Lord-Advocate if he will furnish a list of the fines or deductions made from the earnings of engrossing clerks in the Sasine Office, Edinburgh, during the last five years, the reason for these deductions, and the authority under which they are deducted; and state to which of the public accounts they are credited.

(*Answered by Mr. Scott Dickson.*) The total fines and deductions during the last five years were £18 9s. 6d. out of a total sum earned of £57,509. The fines are imposed on account of irregularities in writing, under authority of the Act of Sederunt of the Lords of Council and Session of 10th July, 1811, and are accounted for by His Majesty's Treasury under Register House Vote.

Scottish Congested Districts Board's Funds.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire): To ask the Lord-Advocate whether he will consider the advisability of providing the funds required for the additional powers proposed to be conferred upon the Congested Districts Board by the Bill now before Parliament from sources other than the funds already allocated to the Board in connection with the duties imposed upon it by existing legislation.

(*Answered by Mr. Scott Dickson.*) If additional powers are conferred upon the Congested Districts Board and the funds at their disposal are found to be inadequate, the Secretary for Scotland will endeavour to obtain such addition to the income of the Board as may be shown to be requisite.

Pauperism in Poplar.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to recent statistics in regard to pauperism, which show that while in East London the proportion of pauperism to population is 1 in 39, the figures for Poplar reach 1 in 15, while in the matter of out-relief the proportion in the eastern districts is 1 out of 200, whilst in Poplar the proportion reaches 1 in 25; and, seeing that these figures are attributable to lack of employment last winter, will he state what action he proposes to take before the House adjourns for the holidays with a view to allay the distress in these districts next winter.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I am aware of the recent statistics as to pauperism. According to my information the figures are not quite as stated in the Question, the most important difference being that as regards out-relief in the eastern district of London, the proportion of persons relieved to population is 1 to 75, and not 1 to 200. Without admitting that the figures are wholly attributable to the cause referred to by the hon. Member, I may point out that the Government have not given up the hope of passing the Unemployed Workmen Bill now before the House, which is concerned with the difficulty arising from distress due to want of employment.

Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will endeavour to obtain facilities for the Second Reading of the Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill, which passed Second Reading last session without a division being taken.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) As I have already stated, I sympathise with the object of the Bill, but I am afraid that at this period of the session facilities could not be given for the further progress of any private Member's Bill which is not entirely uncontroversial.

Aged Paupers in Scottish Poorhouses.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): To ask the Lord-Advocate if he can state the number of paupers over sixty-five years of age in the poorhouses in Scotland in

1881, 1891, 1901, and 1904 respectively, and what proportions these numbers bear to the total individual poor over that age receiving relief as at these respective dates; and also the number of persons in these years who, being over sixty-five years of age, applied for but were refused relief unless they accepted admission to the poorhouse, but who declined relief in that form.

(*Answered by Mr. Scott Dickson.*) I have no information as to the ages of paupers in workhouses in 1881 and 1891. In 1901 it is shown on page 255 of the Census Returns that the total number of poorhouse inmates over sixty-five was 4,502. No later information on this point is available, but steps will be taken to ascertain the facts for the current year, which will then be given in the next Annual Report of the Local Government Board. On the general question as to the ages of poor persons in workhouses, I may refer the hon. Member to the Report on the Methods of Administering Poor Relief in certain large Town Parishes, recently laid upon the Table [Cd. 2524]. No information is available in regard to the latter part of the Question.

Motor-Cars in King's Park, Edinburgh.

Sir LEWIS McIVER (Edinburgh, W.): To ask the Lord-Advocate what are the reasons for excluding motor-cars from the use of the upper road past Dunsappie Loch, in the King's Park, Edinburgh.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The road is reported to be dangerous, and has been closed to motors pending a visit by the First Commissioner of Works in the autumn.

Adrianople Refugees in Bulgaria.

Sir A. HAYTER (Walsall): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state what number of refugees who fled from the province of Adrianople in 1903 still remain in Bulgaria.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The list furnished early in the year by the Bulgarian Government to the Turkish Government showed that about 300 families were awaiting repatriation to the vilayet of Adrianople. According to a Report from His Majesty's Consul at Adrianople, dated 2nd June, the Commissioners appointed by agreement between the two Governments to assist the work of repatriation had commenced regular sittings at two villages on the frontier, and up to that date about 130 refugees had presented themselves.

Throwing Dogs in the Thames—Alleged Cruelty.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the cruelty of continually throwing dogs into the river from the steps in front of St. Thomas's Hospital; and if he will give directions to the police to put a stop to this practice, which is especially prevalent on Sundays.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The police report to me that dogs are frequently taken to the steps near St. Thomas's Hospital to enter the water, being as a rule enticed to do so by the throwing in of a stick. The police have not hitherto observed any act of cruelty on the part of persons in charge of dogs, and failing this they have no power to take any action.

Allowances to Provincial Postmen.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is now in a position to announce particulars of the promised system of allowances to postmen in the provinces.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am not at present in a position to do more than refer the hon. Member to an Answer which I gave on the 5th† instant to a Question on this subject asked by the hon. Member for South Belfast.

Alien Immigration Returns.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether the new monthly Return of Passengers to Places out of Europe, which has been presented but not circulated, and of which the title has been altered in another place, is the promised Return which it was understood would be circulated monthly along with the Alien Immigration Return.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxlviii., 115.

(*Answered by Mr. Bonar Law.*) The Answer is in the affirmative.

Irish Education in Extra Subjects.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the portion of the circular of instructions issued by the Board of National Education to their inspectors, dated January, 1904, relating to the standards in which results fees are payable for extra branches, which formed the subject of a debate in this House on 14th March, 1904, resulting in the defeat of the Government, has been either modified or withdrawn in subsequent instructions; and, if modified, will he say in what way.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long*): The original circular was modified in the manner outlined by my right hon. friend the Member for Dover on 8th March, 1904. I have now sent to the hon. Member copies of the original and amending circulars.

Irish Education Code.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many teachers classed 1 (1) have, under the new Code, got increments since 1900; how many such teachers have got increments on those reports marked good; what are the conditions necessary to warrant increments for such teachers; how many teachers receive the maximum salary of £175 per annum plus capitation; and how many teachers have, since the introduction of the new Code, been promoted to the maximum salary.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) Increments of "good service" salary are given triennially for good service, and all the teachers who received increments must have had "good" or "very good" reports. A good report, however, though an important condition, is not the only one necessary for the award of increment. On the 31st December, 1904, there were eighty-one men principals in receipt of £175 and upwards, exclusive of capitation grant. It would be impossible to say how many teachers have been advanced to the maximum salary since the introduction of the new system without making an exhaustive and laborious investigation, which the Commissioners do not consider would serve any useful purpose.

Public Libraries in Irish Rural Districts.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many rural district councils in Ireland have adopted the Public Libraries Acts; and can he give their names.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) In addition to the nineteen rural district councils set forth in the reply to the hon. Member's Question of 12th April, 1904,† the councils of North Dublin, South Dublin, Wexford, and Youghal No. 1 rural districts have passed resolutions adopting the Act, but the statutory requirements have been complied with in thirteen cases only, viz.: Balrothery, Cahirciveen, Cloneygowan, Dublin (North), Dublin (South), Dundalk, Kinsale, Mallow, Rathdown No. 1, Rathdown No. 11, Rathkeale, Wexford, and Youghal No. 1.

Floods at Westport, County Mayo.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the flooding of certain lands near Westport, county Mayo, the property of the Congested Districts Board, owing to the salmon gaps in the Belclare River being kept closed and the sluices being kept down; and whether, in view of the amount of damage done to the lands of the neighbouring tenants by such floods, he will see that the salmon gaps and sluices are kept in order.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long*). The Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction have caused an inspection of this mill dam to be made, and the necessary steps are being taken to ensure compliance with the statutory regulations in connection with such mill dams.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 22.

Evicted Tenants in County Waterford.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he could state on what estates in the county Waterford have negotiations for the reinstatement of evicted tenants taken place, and on what estate is it hoped to obtain 456 acres for the restoration of three tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long*): It would be contrary to practice and undesirable to give details as to pending negotiations.

South African Horse Disease.

Mr. POWER: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the horse disease, known as South African horse disease, has been practically stamped out among Army horses in Ireland; and will he say whether the disease exists among Army horses in parts of Great Britain; and, if so, whether Army horses before being sent from Great Britain to Ireland will be carefully examined; and whether every possible step will be taken to prevent the reintroduction of this disease into Ireland by Army horses or otherwise.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long*). The reply to the first inquiry is in the affirmative. For information upon the second and third points I must refer the hon. Member to the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. With regard to the concluding inquiry, the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland are in communication with the military authorities with a view to the maintenance of adequate precautions against the reintroduction of the disease into Ireland, and the question whether any, and, if so, what further provision in the matter is necessary is engaging attention.

Lismore Show—Prohibition of Movement of Horses from and into County Waterford.

Mr. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that by Order of the Department of Agriculture, dated 4th July, 1905, the Department has prohibited the movement of horses into the county of Waterford for exhibition at Lismore Show, and the movement of horses from the county Waterford for exhibition at any show, and has also prohibited the exhibition of any horse located in the county Waterford at any show within the county without previous inspection by the Department, and that this Order came into force on the 6th July, 1905, which was the last day of Cork Show; and whether, seeing that several horses from county Waterford were exhibited at Cork Show without restriction, and that horses are not restricted in their movement from the county Waterford to public fairs held outside it, and that disease only appeared in the eastern part of Waterford county and is now practically stamped out, the Department will withdraw this order so far as it relates to Lismore Show, provided an inspection takes place and a certificate is given by the Department's inspector prior to the admission of such horse to the show grounds.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The Cork Show commenced before the date on which the Order took effect, and exhibits of horses thereat from county Waterford were not interfered with. No restrictions have so far been imposed on fairs. It is not accurate to say that epizootic lymphangitis has appeared only in the eastern part of the county Waterford. The last outbreak occurred at Dungarvan so recently as the 30th June. It is too soon to conclude that the disease has been practically stamped out, and the Department are not prepared to modify the Order so far as Lismore Show is concerned.

Case of Mr. William Davies, of Dominica.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the result of his inquiries into the case of Mr. William Davies, of Dominica, West Indies.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) A petition to His Majesty the King in Council from Mr. William Davies, praying that a judgment of the Supreme Court of the Leeward Islands might be varied, was duly forwarded in May last to the Registrar of the Privy Council, who, Mr. Lyttelton understands, addressed a letter to Mr. Davies on the 25th of that month explaining the steps which he should take in order to bring his petition before His Majesty in Council.

Labourers in South African Mines.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what were the respective numbers of whites and Kaffirs employed in the South African mines in May, 1904, before the arrival of the first importation of Chinese labour; and what were the respective numbers of whites, Kaffirs, and Chinese in June and December, 1904, and March, 1905.

(Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.) The following are the figures asked for; they are to be found at page 76 and page 96 of [Cd. 2401]:—

Transvaal Gold Mines.	Whites.	Kaffirs (coloured)	Chinese.
May, 1904 - - - - - -	13,127	77,519	Nil.
June, 1904 - - - - - -	13,413	74,632	1,004
December, 1904 - - - - -	15,023	83,639	20,885
March, 1905 - - - - -	16,225	105,184	34,335

Army Band Instruments.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to alter the pitch of the instruments in the bands of the Household Brigade; and, if so, whether he can state the object of the change, the cost of the alteration, and upon whom such cost would fall.

(Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.) The King's Regulations lay down that in order to insure uniformity throughout the bands of the service, the instruments are to be the pitch known as the Kneller Hall pitch. No proposal has reached this office to alter the pitch of the instruments of the Household Brigade.

Non-Commissioned Officers and Plain Clothes.

MR. COLSTON (Gloucestershire, Thornbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he could see his way to extend the permission already granted to non-commissioned officers in the Army to wear plain clothes when absent from duty with their regiments.

(Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.) The King's Regulations already permit commanding officers to give permission to dress in plain clothes when on furlough or pass to non-commissioned officers and men of good character.

Sleeping Accommodation for Soldiers on Guard.

MR. COLSTON: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any and, if so, what improvements have been made in the sleeping accommodation provided for soldiers when on guard; and, if such improvement has been made, will he state in what barracks it has been effected.

(Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.) A new pattern guard-bed, with steel spring mattress, has been approved and is being supplied to the following stations, viz.: London, Kingston, Guildford, Tidworth, Bulford, Plymouth, Portsea, Gosport, Netley, Portland, and Dorchester.

Volunteer Musketry Regulations.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War under which paragraph of the Volunteer Regulations a Volunteer is asked or required to qualify as a first-class shot; and if he can state the standard of musketry efficiency necessary to qualify under paragraph 4, Army Council Circular, of 20th June, 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The regulations laying down the standard of efficiency for first-class shots of Volunteers will be found in the Provisional Musketry Regulations published in 1903; this standard is 100 points. It must be remembered that Volunteer corps can still fire under the old provisions contained in the Volunteer Regulations of 1901.

Romford Volunteer Artillery.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): To ask the Secretary of State for War what reason, if any, the War Office has in not supplying the Romford battery of Artillery Volunteers with modern guns as promised, seeing that the battery is in every way equal in efficiency with the other batteries of the battalion which are so supplied.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The stock of those modern guns has hitherto only been sufficient to supply companies of Volunteer garrison artillery which are allotted to coast defences on mobilisation, and the company mentioned is not so allotted.

Naval Works Bill.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the Naval Works Bill will be introduced.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) As I have informed the hon. Member for East Perthshire, the Bill is ready, but I cannot yet fix a date for its introduction. I will give the best notice I can.

Irish Parliamentary Representation.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state what the Parliamentary representation of Ireland would have been if determined on the basis of population at the time of the passing of the Reform Act of 1832 and in the years 1842 and 1852 respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) It is not practicable to state what was the precise population in the years mentioned in the Question, but it is probably sufficient to take the figures in the Reports of the Census taken in the years 1831, 1841, and 1851 respectively. On this assumption, and taking the number of Members of the House of Commons as 658, the Parliamentary representation of Ireland in the years 1832, 1842, and 1852 would, on the basis of population, have apparently been 212, 201, and 157 respectively.

Submarine Vessels in War.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will communicate with foreign Governments with a view to abolish the use of submarine vessels for purposes of war.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I think the proposal is hardly practicable.

The War Stores Commission Act.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in framing the Statutory Commission Bill, the Government have considered the fact that an officer cannot be tried or punished for any offence triable by Court-martial committed more than three years before the date at which his trial begins; and how, in the event of it appearing from the evidence in the possession of the Government, or that may be adduced before the Royal Commission, or from the Report of the Commission, that any officer ought to be tried by Court-martial for offences arising in respect of the dealings with Government stores in South Africa in 1902, does he propose to deal with the matter so as to prevent such officer availing himself of a plea of statutory time limit arising from the delay in inquiring into and ascertaining the facts.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The question of the term within which an officer may be tried by Court-martial is entirely outside the scope of the War Stores Commission Act. That Act has been framed to secure the complete disclosure of all the facts, and for this purpose provides for indemnity being given to witnesses; but it would have been altogether irregular to include in it provisions for altering the period of limitation for trials by Courts-martial.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Deal Barracks Theatre.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state whether the theatre situated within the barrack walls at Deal was built at the public expense; and, if so, at what cost, and under what Vote its maintenance is provided for; will he say under what regulations the colonel commanding sanctions the performance of plays to which the public are admitted; and whether any income is derived from the public notices which appear on the barrack walls announcing theatrical performances.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARTHUR LEE, Hampshire, Fareham): The building in question was built at the public expense at a cost of £3,622. Its maintenance is provided for under Navy Vote 10, Subhead L, and the average expenditure is about £20 per annum The so-called "theatre" is under the control of the officer in command of the barracks at Deal, and its general management, including admission, is arranged by a committee of officers, the object of such management being the amusement of the men in barracks together with their relations and friends. The reply to the last portion of the hon. Member's Question is that orders were issued some years ago that no public notices as to the performances at the theatre were to be posted on the barrack walls, and so far as is known no income ever was, or is, derived from this source.

MR. WEIR: I have seen these notices on the barrack walls. Will the right hon. Gentleman see that the orders are in future complied with?

*MR. ARTHUR LEE: I will inquire into the matter.

Percentages of Marksmen.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the percentages of marksmen, first-class shots, second-class shots, and third-class shots in the Volunteer infantry and Regular infantry forces respectively.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The percentages required are as follows:—

	Marksmen.	1st Class.	2nd Class.	3rd Class.
Regular Infantry	9·6	27·3	41·6	21·3
Volunteer Infantry:				
Old Course	37·0	—	62·6	0·2
New Course	20·3	44·2	29·7	5·6

Volunteer battalions may elect which of these courses is to be fired. It must be pointed out that these figures do not serve for purposes for comparison, as the courses shot by Regular and Volunteer infantry are entirely different.

Volunteer Marksmen.

MR. FREDERICK WILSON (Norfolk, Mid.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether only first-class shots are now considered by the Army Council as fit for active service; if he can state what percentage of the British Army come under the designation of first-class shots; and if he can state what steps it is intended to take to increase the number of first-class shots among Regulars and Volunteers.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: As I have already informed the House, the possession of a first-class certificate by a Regular soldier is not a necessary qualification for active service abroad. The percentage of first-class shots in the Regular Army on the home establishment was 29·85 of the total of the men who fired classification practices. As regards the last paragraph of the Question, the General Staff of the Army is constantly engaged in endeavours to improve the shooting both of the Regulars and the Volunteers, and these efforts will not in any way be relaxed in the future.

Bordon Military Camp.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the sewage from the military camp at Bordon is flowing direct into the River Wey, and from thence into the River Thames, without being treated or disinfected in any way; and whether the War Office intends to take any steps to deal with the sewage before discharging it into the River Wey.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Will the hon. Member kindly refer to my reply to a Question on this subject put by the hon. and gallant Member for Bath on the 10th instant.†

Chinese Attacks on Whites on the Rand.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any information as to recent attacks upon the white population on the Rand by Chinese coolies; whether any steps are being taken to protect the white population against outbreaks on the part of the Chinese coolies; and what are the numbers at present on the Rand of the adult male whites and Chinese coolies, respectively.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I am not aware that any attacks have been made upon the white population in general. There was a disturbance in the Crœsus Mine a short while ago when some white miners were assailed and a white miner lost his life. The full investigation of the proceedings has not yet reached me. I understand that the numbers at present on the Rand of adult male whites is about 50,000 and of Chinese coolies 44,000.

Railway Development in Northern Nigeria.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any decision has yet been arrived at in reference to the question of railway development in Northern Nigeria; and, if no decision has been arrived at, whether, having regard to the impossibility of industrial progress on any large scale, either in cotton-growing or other industries, until a railway is made, and the unlikelihood of the grant-in-aid being reduced until industrial development does take place, he can say when a decision is likely to be arrived at.

MR. LYTTELTON: No decision has yet been arrived at, but the report of the survey for a railway from the Niger to Kano has now been received and is under consideration. I should add, with reference to the grant-in-aid, that the amount inserted in the Estimates for the current year is £320,000, which is £85,000 less than the amount which was voted in 1904–5.

MR. EMMOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay a Paper upon the Table giving particulars of the various plans and estimates for alternative schemes of light and heavy railways in Northern Nigeria; and whether he will include in it the despatches of Sir Frederick Lugard on the question (if any).

MR. LYTTELTON: A Paper will be laid giving the particulars asked for and including despatches from Sir F. Lugard and others on the question.

Flogging of Chinese Coolies in the Transvaal Mines.

*MR. BRIGHT (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the number, if any, of Chinese coolies who have been flogged up to date in the various compounds of the Rand respectively; what is the maximum number of lashes which has been inflicted; what has been the instrument used, and for what offences; and by whose authority such floggings, if any, have been inflicted.

MR. LYTTELTON: The returns from July last up to the end of April of this year show that eight Chinese labourers have received the punishment of flogging; the maximum number of lashes inflicted was twenty; the instrument used is a cane; and the offence "assault with intent to do grievous bodily harm." The sentence is imposed by a magistrate and has to be confirmed by a Judge of the Supreme Court.

---

† See page 76.

*MR. BRIGHT: Is it the practice in the compounds for the Chinese police to inflict corporal punishment on the demand of the master of the compound, and are these cases included in the number given by the right hon. Gentleman?

MR. LYTTELTON: I have no such information.

*MR. BRIGHT: Will you inquire by cable?

MR. LYTTELTON: I will if some reasonable *prima facie* cause is shown, but I cannot act on mere loose allegation.

*MR. BRIGHT: I will supply the right hon. Gentleman with the information he requires.

MR. BURT (Morpeth): Have the compound managers or any other officials authority to flog or order the flogging of Chinese in the Transvaal?

MR. LYTTELTON: No flogging can be administered except on the sentence of a magistrate confirmed by a Judge of the Supreme Court?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is done every day.

Zionists in East Africa.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if any further offer of territory has been made to the Zionists in East Africa beyond that made by the Foreign Office in 1902; if he is aware that the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs stated that the House would have the opportunity of considering the matter before being finally determined; and if he will lay upon the Table of the House full particulars of the original offer, of the report of the Zionist expedition on the said offer, and also particulars of any additional or modified offer he may have made.

MR. LYTTELTON: No additional or modified offer of territory has been made. I am aware that the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs stated in the House on the 27th of June† last year that the Papers relating to the negotiations with the Zionists would be laid before a final decision was arrived at, and I shall, of course, bear that pledge in mind.

Cruelty to a Native at the Crœsus Gold Mine.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has yet received the report asked for by him from the Governor of the Transvaal on the case of cruelty to a native at the Crœsus Gold Mine, Langlaagte; and whether the contractor, who was convicted and fined for the offence, has been removed from his post: and what are the steps recommended by the Transvaal Government with a view to preventing the occurrence of such offences.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have asked Lord Selborne, as I promised, for a report on this case, but I have not been able to receive a report as yet.

MR. LEIF JONES: Is it coming by cable?

MR. LYTTELTON: No, by mail.

MR. LEIF JONES: Would it not be advisable to cable, seeing that this contractor is still in charge of the mine?

MR. LYTTELTON: This man has already been fined. Lord Selborne has taken steps to prevent a recurrence of such acts, and there is ample evidence that neither he nor I are indifferent in the matter.

The Banishment of Madho Singh.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the petition presented to the House by the Member for South Down signed by 600 inhabitants, the former subjects of the Rajput chief of Pannah, Madho Singh, who has been banished on alleged false charges, praying that he may be restored; will the Government ascertain from the Viceroy of India before what tribunal the Raja was tried; what was the constitution of the Court; how the decision was received in the district; and what answer the Indian Government has to offer to the statements in the petition.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvi., 1241.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): My attention has been called to the petition referred to. I made a full statement on the subject in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for North Manchester on the 30th June,† 1904, to which I would refer the hon. Member. I then stated that a Commission had been appointed to investigate judicially charges of murder by poison in which the ex-Maharaja was implicated; and that the views of the Government of India on the findings of the Commission, and the action taken thereon, were published in the *Gazette of India* in a Resolution dated the 21st April, 1902.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Before what tribunal was he tried?

MR. BRODRICK: The whole question was gone into judicially by the Indian Government in the usual manner.

MR. MACVEAGH: Was he not banished without any trial and without any charge being preferred against him?

MR. BRODRICK: The whole matter was carefully considered.

MR. WEIR: Several times, years ago, I asked a similar Question and never could get a satisfactory Answer.

Consular Reports on Irish Trade.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Foreign Office will instruct all its Consuls to embody in their Reports for the year 1905 a special Report as to the existence or non-existence, as the case may be, of trade relations between Ireland and the country or district to which they are accredited, with a view to determining whether the statistics as regards Irish trade shall be kept distinct in all future Consular Reports from those of Great Britain.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): There is no objection to requesting His Majesty's Consuls to state in their Reports for 1905 whether, so far as they can ascertain, any trade is carried on between their respective districts and Ireland. But as the Secretary to the Board of Trade has already informed the hon. Member, Consuls are dependent for official statistics of the trade of their districts on the authorities of the countries in which they reside, and the question of keeping separate records of such trade is one solely for the foreign Governments concerned.

Zervi Outrages.

MR. LYELL (Dorsetshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Sir Nicholas O'Conor made any representations early in April last to the Porte with regard to the outrages which took place at the village of Zervi on March 27th last; whether he urged the arrest and punishment of those responsible for the outrages; and, if so, whether any attention has been paid by the Porte to his representations.

EARL PERCY: Immediately on receipt of the news of the outrages committed at Zervi Sir Nicholas O'Conor made most earnest representations to the Sublime Porte respecting the lack of discipline shown by the troops, and the necessity of taking effective steps to prevent such incidents. The Grand Vizier gave an assurance that an inquiry would be held and the officers punished, and promised to use his best efforts in the sense urged by the Ambassador. A Commission of Turkish officers has proceeded to Macedonia to conduct an inquiry into the state of military discipline. The result of this inquiry has not yet been reported, but the accounts received of later encounters between the troops and the insurgent bands have shown a marked improvement in the conduct of the Turkish soldiers.

Sale of Poisons to Agriculturists.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture when he proposes to introduce his Bill dealing with the sale of substances used extensively and in large quantity in horticulture and agriculture, but which are technically included as poisons under the schedules of the Pharmacy Act, in view of the efforts made to monopolise the trade in such articles by retail druggists, to the injury of these industries of farming and gardening.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvii., 159.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES, Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): The Bill in question falls within the province of the Privy Council rather than my own, but I am in communication with my noble friend the Lord President as to the advisability of its introduction at no distant date.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS: Is it in an advanced state of preparation?

*MR. AILWYN FELLOWES: Yes, Sir.

Canadian Cattle.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he has seen that Mr. Fisher, the Canadian Minister of Agriculture, speaking officially on Friday in the House of Commons at Ottawa, pointed out that since the embargo was imposed a million and a half of Canadian cattle have been disembarked at British ports under the supervision of inspectors who could readily detect disease, and there had not been discovered the slightest sign of it; and whether the supposed danger of disease being introduced into Canada from the United States having, after several years experience, proved unfounded, he will now advise His Majesty's Government that the embargo on the importation of Canadian cattle may be safely removed.

*MR. AILWYN FELLOWES: I have seen telegraphic summaries of the speech to which the hon. Member refers, from which I gather that a further official communication is about to be addressed to us by the Canadian Government. We shall, of course, give any such communication our respectful consideration, but it would be premature for me as yet to add anything to what I have already stated on the subject or to anticipate the reply to be given to any representations which we may receive.

Plural Voters.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state the number of individual electors in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales respectively, as contrasted with the number of voters in each of those portions of the United Kingdom obtained by a summation of the voters' rolls containing the names of voters entered in more than one constituency, including the University voters.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am unable to give the information desired by the hon. Member.

MR. BLACK: Are we to understand that the Government formulated their Redistribution proposals without forming any estimate of the number of plural voters?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Certainly.

North Eastern Railway — Accidents Caused by Electrically-Charged Rails.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether he is aware that two more accidents have recently occurred on the North-Eastern Railway through contact with an electrically-charged rail; and whether the Board are taking any further steps to protect the public from the danger of accidents of this character.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. BONAR LAW, Glasgow, Blackfriars): The North-Eastern Railway Company have notified the Board of Trade of two recent accidents of this character to persons trespassing on their lines, and the Board are in communication with the company on the matter.

Civil Servants and Members of Parliament.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer when he proposes to recommend the Government to give effect to his proposal respecting the appointment of some permanent body or Commission, outside the sphere of electoral pressure and Party differences, which might advise the Government on matters connected with the salaries and position of Post Office officials.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): My proposal is not quite correctly stated in the hon. Member's Question. It was that if the suggestion was generally approved, a Committee of this House might be appointed to lay down the principles by which the wages of employees of the State should be fixed, and to consider whether it would be possible to create some permanent body or Commission, outside the sphere of electoral pressure and Party conflicts, to advise the Government of the day in the application of these principles to particular cases. I am now endeavouring to ascertain the opinion of Members upon this suggestion. It can only be proceeded with if it meets with general approval.

Assistant Clerks in the Government Service.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that sorters and telegraphists on attaining the age of twenty-five years are granted an additional increment of 3s. per week by reason of their reaching a marriageable age, and seeing that assistant clerks (new class) at the age specified will have served for a longer period and passed a more severe educational test while performing work of a superior nature, he will consider the advisability of granting a similar increment to assistant clerks (new class).

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): The position and pay of the assistant clerks has been most fully considered and a decision thereon arrived at and communicated to heads of Departments last May. I can see no grounds for reopening the question.

Special Police Courts for Children.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he proposes to issue a circular to the Courts of summary jurisdiction under his supervision in London and elsewhere, calling attention to the beneficial results in Canada, Australia, Ireland, and America attending the hearing of cases and applications in which children under sixteen are concerned apart from the adult criminal business and from the pernicious influence of ordinary night charges; and if. pending the enactment of the Bill definitely legalising this procedure, he will recommend the extension to other places of the experiments made in this direction in Manchester, Birmingham, and Bradford.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I have recently been in communication with the magistrates of the Metropolitan Police Courts on this subject, and while, so far as these Courts are concerned, I am satisfied that the present arrangements are, generally speaking, sufficient to secure the desired end, I have, in consultation with the chief magistrate, laid down certain rules on the subject which will secure uniformity of practice. I am now considering what steps I can usefully take to encourage the adoption of similar arrangements in other Courts where they are not already in existence.

Vaccination Exemptions.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that, although an applicant for a certificate of exemption from vaccination at Westminster Police Court on Saturday last based his objection on the ground that he conscientiously believed that vaccination would be prejudicial to the health of his child, the magistrate proceeded to cross-examine him and refused to grant the certificate; will he state whether the circular containing the opinion of the Lord Chief Justice in regard to the manner in which magistrates should deal with applications for certificates of exemption has been sent to this magistrate; and will he direct the magistrate's special attention to that opinion. [The hon. Member, in putting the Question, complained that it had been mutilated at the Table by cutting out the name of the magistrate, Mr. Curtis Bennett.]

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The circular containing the remarks of the Lord Chief Justice, to which the hon. Member refers, was sent to all the metropolitan magistrates. Under the statute, which requires the applicant to satisfy the magistrates as to the conscientious nature of his objection, the magistrate has a discretion entrusted to him with which I have no power to interfere.

MR. WEIR: Will the right hon. Gentleman again communicate with this magistrate? He, at any rate, appears to be obdurate.

[No Answer was returned.]

MR. MACVEAGH: As names are frequently deleted from Questions at the Table, may I ask if there is any rule that protects magistrates from having their names given when they are accused of improper conduct.

*MR. SPEAKER: It has been the custom to omit names where they are associated with allegations and are not necessary for clearness.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): Should not the Member be communicated with before a Question is altered?

*MR. SPEAKER: It is the custom for the Clerk at the Table to put himself in communication with an hon. Member when his Question is not in order, but the difficulty is that often a Member hands in notice of a Question, then goes away, and it is not possible to communicate with him.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is it not the rule that the Clerks at the Table should not alter a Question without the authority of Mr. Speaker?

*MR. SPEAKER: Every Question is not brought to me; only those in which the Clerk at the Table has any doubt.

SIR GEORGE BARTLEY (Islington, N.): Is it not desirable to make a rule that no Question should be altered and printed without the Member putting it being informed? It would save a great deal of annoyance.

*MR. SPEAKER: It might not be possible to see the hon. Member, who might be annoyed if the Question were not printed.

Assaults on the London Police.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the statement recently made by Sir Ralph Littler, in passing sentence at the Middlesex Sessions, to the effect that more than 3,000 policemen are incapacitated from duty every year as the result of violence done to them in the execution of their duty, and to complaints made by Judges, magistrates, and the police as to bands of persons who raise hostile mobs against the police, actively assist in assaults committed upon them, and by terrorism make the obtaining of evidence in any subsequent prosecution difficult or impossible; and whether he will introduce legislation for providing the police with special powers in such districts, and for enlarging the maximum penalty which it is now within the power of Judges and police magistrates to inflict in such cases.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I have not seen the particular remarks referred to in the Question; but I am, of course, well acquainted with the great number of cases in which the police are injured by assaults, and I and my predecessors have repeatedly had to consider what action could be taken to protect them. The number of Metropolitan Police injured by assaults while on duty during the year 1904 was 2,799, and of these 276 were incapacitated for a week or more. I do not think, however, that any such legislation as the hon. Member suggests is necessary. The punishment which can be imposed under the existing law is already very severe—for an ordinary assault on a constable, a magistrate can impose a sentence of six, or, if it be a second offence, of nine months imprisonment with hard labour, and the Court of quarter sessions can impose two years; while for wounding or inflicting grievous bodily harm far heavier sentences can be passed. I find that the maximum sentence which the existing law allows is very rarely imposed.

Mr. HAVILAND BURKE: Is it not the fact that Sir Ralph Littler, in sentencing a man who had nearly murdered a policeman and had been helped in the attempt by a crowd, deplored the fact that he could not give him more than four years penal servitude.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I have not seen the report of that case.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the number of policemen incapacitated by violence from duty last year in London was exactly a hundred times more than the number in Ireland?

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): When the right hon. Gentleman says he does not propose to introduce legislation does he mean he dare not, or that it is not desirable?

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of assimilating the laws of England and Ireland on this point?

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I have said I think the law in England on this matter is satisfactory.

Compensation to Injured Policemen.

Mr. HAVILAND BURKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is prepared to introduce legislation whereby an English policeman, who under the present law gets no more than his pay and medical expenses while incapacitated from duty by violence, will be placed on a level with the Irish policeman, who in a similar case has a claim on the local rates for compensation.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: A police officer who is injured in the execution of his duty receives, it seems to me, liberal treatment. He has full pay and free medical attendance till he is able to return to duty; or, if he has to retire, he is awarded a pension on a high scale. The charge on local rates for the non-effective pay of the police is already a heavy one; and I do not think that I should be justified in proposing, or that Parliament would be willing to accept, legislation which would have the result of increasing it.

Mr. HAVILAND BURKE: My Question is not what the Englishman gets, but will he be placed on a level with the Irish policeman by being allowed to claim compensation from the ratepayers? The right hon. Gentleman has not answered that.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I thought I had done so, at any rate by inference. I think the scale allowed in this country is a liberal one.

Mr. HAVILAND BURKE: It is not a question whether it is liberal or illiberal. Is it not the fact that the Irish policeman, when incapacitated by violence, gets not merely full pay and free medical attendance, but, in addition, a handsome sum by way of compensation which is levied on the rates? Will the right hon. Gentleman put the English policeman on the same footing?

***Mr. SPEAKER**: The hon. Member has got a perfectly straightforward Answer to his Question, viz., that the right hon. Gentleman does not propose to introduce any such legislation.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Irish policemen get thousands of pounds compensation at the expense of the ratepayers?

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: That is under a particular statute.

Mr. FLAVIN: And in a particular country.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Equal laws for all!

Street Trading by Girls.

Mr. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department in how many and what cases by-laws prohibiting street trading by girls under sixteen have been proposed to his Department; in how many and what cases have these by-laws been sanctioned; in how many and what cases has such sanction been accompanied by conditions; and can he lay upon the Table a Paper setting forth this information, accompanied by the conditions which he has imposed.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: Up to the present time thirty-four local authorities have drafted by-laws under the Employment of Children Act prohibiting street trading by girls under sixteen years of age. In fifteen of these cases the by-laws have been formally confirmed, and in six more they have been provisionally approved. The only modifications suggested by the Home Office have been the addition of a proviso exempting girls trading in the company of a parent, or in the company of a parent or guardian, from the operation of the by-law; and in one case, where the circumstances were exceptional, of a proviso exempting girls between the ages of fourteen and sixteen who were already engaged in street trading at the time of the confirmation of the by-law. In the circumstances I do not think that any advantage would be gained by laying a Paper on the Table, as suggested by the hon. Member; but I shall be happy to furnish him, if he wishes, with particulars of the individual cases.

Attacks on Warders at Princetown.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the number of recent attacks on warders by prisoners in His Majesty's prison at Princetown; and if he will consider the advisability of seeking to prevent these attacks by providing warders with some more effective method of defence.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: There has been no special increase recently in the number of attacks on warders at Dartmoor Convict Prison; it is quite inevitable that, considering the character of the population (Dartmoor contains more than 1,000 of the worst criminals in England), outbreaks of bad temper resulting in actual violence should from time to time occur, but there have only been six assaults on prison officers this year and seven last year. I see no reason for thinking that any special measures are necessary for the protection of officers beyond those which are prescribed in the existing prison regulations.

Observance of the Lord's Day in Scotland.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if he will take further steps to enforce the statute law in Scotland against the public desecration of the Lord's day by the closing of establishments for the demoralisation of young people.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): I am not clear as to what the hon. Member means by "establishments for the demoralisation of young people." According to long-established practice proceedings under the statutes referred to by the hon. Member fall to be instituted by the Burgh Fiscal or by a common informer, and I am not prepared to make any departure from this practice.

Beaufort Castle Shooting Outrage.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if his attention has been called to a shooting case at Beaufort Castle, in Scotland; and will he say what steps are being taken to punish the offender.

MR. WEIR: I beg also to ask the Lord-Advocate whether he is aware that one of the sons of Mr. Phipps, the occupant of Beaufort Castle, Inverness-shire, recently fired at the four occupants of a boat on a river on the estate, and shot in the face John Allan Fraser, an employee of Lord Lovat, wounding him so severely as to necessitate the removal of one eye, the condition of the other being almost hopeless; will he state whether Mr. Phipps, the assailant, has been placed under arrest; if not, will he explain why this has not been done; and whether it is proposed to hold a public inquiry into the circumstances of the case.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: Beyond seeing the newspaper reports my attention was not specially called to the occurrence until the hon. Members' Questions appeared on the Paper—nor was it necessary that it should, as such a case required to be inquired into at once by the Procurator-Fiscal in the ordinary course of his duty, and this was done. I regret to say that Fraser has lost one eye and the other has been seriously injured, though it is hoped it may be saved. Messrs. John and Henry Phipps were yesterday charged before the sheriff and committed for trial. The sheriff has released them on bail of £500 each. The precise form of the further proceedings in the matter are being considered by counsel.

Mr. WEIR: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that these men, who are certainly undesirable aliens, are kept under strict police supervision?

Mr. SCOTT DICKSON: The hon. Member knows I have no power to place any one under supervision.

Mr. WEIR: I hope the right hon. Gentleman will take care to prevent a repetition of this outrage.

Irish Land Judge's Court.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say how many estates are now in the Land Judge's Court, showing the county and parish in which each estate is situated and the name of the solicitor having carriage of sale.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.): The Land Judge is unable to detach his staff from the proper duties of his Court for the preparation of this Return, the advantages to be derived from which would be quite disproportionate to the labour and loss of time involved in its preparation. Parliamentary Paper No. 182 of 1904 gives, by counties, the names and other particulars of estates then in the Land Judge's Court.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman give a continuation of that Return?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I have no objection, but I should first like to consult the Land Judge.

Land Purchase Agreements.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners are now empowered to inquire into the free and *bona fide* character of provisional agreements lodged with them in the cases of sales of estates direct to them, in order to ascertain whether tenants were compelled by the pressure of arrears or the withdrawal of turbary and other rights to agree to excessive prices when signing such agreements.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The jurisdiction conferred on the Land Commission by Section 10 of the Land Act of 1885, enabling them to relieve tenants who have been coerced to enter into agreements by duress, is unaffected by these regulations, which do not deal with the matter at all.

Mr. MURPHY: What is meant by the reference to intimidation in the new regulations? Is it intimidation on the part of the landlord or of the tenant?

Mr. WALTER LONG: It is any intimidation which seeks to bring about agreements which would not otherwise be made?

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: And who is to be the judge of it?

Mr. WALTER LONG: The Commissioners, I presume.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants.

Mr. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the effect of the new regulation issued to the Estates Commissioners directing them to give consideration to the applications of evicted tenants who lost their holdings in consequence of some general rent dispute will have the effect of preventing the Commissioners from doing anything in the interest of tenants who were evicted from estates in consequence of a particular rent dispute in their own cases; or whether he will explain the effect of this regulation on the action of the Commissioners in regard to evicted tenants.

MR. WALTER LONG: The regulation, which was designed to embody the present practice, should be read in connection with Section 2 of the Act. It was not intended to restrict, and does not restrict, the right conferred by that section on any evicted tenant, but merely directs, in effect, that in disposing of untenanted lands for the benefit of evicted tenants preference should, consistently with that section, be given to cases in which the tenants lost their holdings owing to a general rent dispute, that is to say, the Plan of Campaign cases commonly so called. This, I fancied, was desired by all parties.

MR. MURPHY: Will the right hon. Gentleman make representations to the Estates Commissioners to do something for the evicted tenants in the South of Ireland?

MR. WALTER LONG: I believe the Answer given embodies the view generally held at the time the matter was debated, and I am not prepared to go beyond that.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if it is pointed out to the Estates Commissioners that landlords of certain estates which have not been offered for sale under the provisions of the Land Act, 1903, have untenanted lands on their own hands suitable for the reinstatement of tenants whose former holdings have been let, or for the enlargement of uneconomic holdings, will the Estates Commissioners approach such landlords with the view of purchasing such lands for the purpose of providing evicted tenants with suitable farms, or enlarging uneconomic holdings.

MR. WALTER LONG: No, Sir; the Estates Commissioners do not open negotiations with landlords who have not expressed a desire to sell.

In reply to a further Question the right hon. Gentleman said there were an enormous number of cases already before the Commissioners, and he did not think there was any necessity to go out of the way to invite further applications.

Charge against Gurteen Constables.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to the conviction of Sergeant Dunphy and Constable Daly at Gurteen Petty Sessions on Friday for assaulting two civilians, whether the attention of the Lord Chancellor will be called to the fact that one of the adjudicating justices suggested to the defendants what witnesses they should call and how the defence should be conducted; whether he is aware that the resident magistrate afforded the justice of the peace an opportunity of retiring from the hearing of the case; whether any complaints have previously been made with reference to the political bias of the same justice of the peace; and whether he will advise the Lord Chancellor to remove this gentleman from the commission of the peace.

MR. WALTER LONG: I have seen a newspaper report of this case, from which it appears that during the hearing Lord Ashtown, one of the magistrates, asked one of the defendants whether he intended to call a certain witness whom he had announced on the previous Court day he had summoned, but who had not appeared on that occasion. The complainants' solicitor at once objected to Lord Ashtown adjudicating in the case, whereupon the presiding resident magistrate said that he had not heard the remark complained of, but it was for Lord Ashtown to say whether he would adjudicate. Lord Ashtown replied that he would continue to act, and he did so. I am not aware that any previous complaints in regard to Lord Ashtown's action as a magistrate have been made. The Answer to the concluding inquiry is in the negative.

MR. REDDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been directed to the proceedings before the Petty Sessions Court at Gurteen, county Galway, on July 7th, when Sergeant William Dunphy and Constable Edward Daly of the Royal

Irish Constabulary were convicted and fined for assault; will he say whether Sheridan and Daly are doing duty at Cloncagh protection station; and, if so, whether, in view of the conduct of these policemen, he will take steps in the interest of public order in the district to have these policemen removed or reprimanded.

Mr. WALTER LONG: On two occasions the magistrates were equally divided in this case, and eventually, on the third hearing, the two policemen were convicted by a majority of the Bench and fined 2s. 6d. each. The policemen applied that the penalties should be increased with a view to an appeal, but the Bench, by the same majority, refused the application. The constables are not now stationed at Cloncagh. Their conduct on the occasion in question is under the consideration of the Inspector-General.

Mr. REDDY: Are these the men the right hon. Gentleman said he was dependent on when he arrived in Dublin to take up his office?

[No Answer was returned.]

Public Accounts Committee's Report.

Dr. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now state when the House will be given the opportunity to discuss the Report of the Public Accounts Committee of July, 1904, and of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of January, 1905.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I do not think it would be desirable to add to the subjects to be discussed on the evening I have given to the Public Accounts Committee. The Auditor-General's Report which the hon. Gentleman wants to discuss is still under the discussion of the Public Accounts Committee, and I do not think it would be in accordance with precedent that we should, while a Committee of this House is by Order of the House discussing a subject, bring it down for discussion here.

Dr. MACNAMARA: I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he seriously considers that three hours is anything like sufficient to enable the House adequately to discuss the many matters raised in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have to make two observations on that. One is that the House of Commons has never had any opportunity before, under the universal practice of the House, of discussing this Report. The other is that if the difficulty which the hon. Gentleman feels in dealing with the whole subject is so great it will surely be greater if he adds to it.

Dr. MACNAMARA: I ask for another occasion.

Evictions in the Island of Lewis.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will introduce legislation to prevent further evictions on the Matheson Estate, Island of Lewis, of persons who have erected their own dwellings, and who will be absolutely without shelter during the coming winter.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not propose to bring in any legislation on this subject.

Mr. WEIR: Why not substitute this for the Redistribution scheme which nobody wants? Will you do that?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

King's Lynn and the Redistribution Proposals.

Mr. FREDERICK WILSON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can take steps to prevent the weakening of the rural interest caused by taking away Members from counties where the electorate is comparatively large and retaining Members in boroughs where the electorate is inconsiderable; whether, by the Redistribution proposals, one of the county constituencies in Norfolk with a population of over 40,000 will be obliterated, whereas the borough of King's Lynn, in the same county, with a population of 20,000, will be retained; and whether some modification can be made in the Redistribution proposals so that small boroughs, instead of having an absolutely separate existence, are made the heads of county districts.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think perhaps the simplest way of answering the hon. Gentleman is to point out to him that, even if King's Lynn is merged in the county, the county will still, under the scheme of the Government, lose one seat, which the hon. Gentleman very naturally deplores.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the population of King's Lynn is not 20,000, as stated, but over 20,000; that ever since I have been the Member for King's Lynn the population has annually increased, and that it is still increasing.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I quite accept the hon. Gentleman's statement upon that matter.

The International Conference.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether any further negotiations have taken place with regard to the International Conference proposed by the President of the United States; whether His Majesty's Government are prepared to acquiesce in the President's proposal to include, among the subjects of discussion, the question of making all private property, not contraband of war, free from capture or destruction by belligerents at sea; and whether any Papers can yet be laid upon the Table.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have nothing material to add to the statement made by Lord Lansdowne a short time ago in the House of Lords, that His Majesty's Government have cordially welcomed the proposal of the President of the United States, and that, in common with other nations, they have reserved to themselves the right to consider what questions shall be submitted to the conference.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: There have been no further negotiations?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

The Unemployed Workmen Bill.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury a Question of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether he has considered the appeal made last night, on the Motion for the adjournment, by the Labour Members, and whether he is prepared to grant facilities for passing the Unemployed Bill by extending, if necessary for that purpose, the session beyond its ordinary length or by holding Saturday sittings.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In my view, the only possibility of passing the Unemployed Bill in the course of the present session is that it should pass as an uncontentious measure, which I hope might be arranged if both sides were prepared to make some concessions the one to the other. I ought to add that the task of the Government, or any Government, in dealing with this question has not been facilitated by the fact that some hon. Gentlemen opposite who are greatly interested in this measure have stated it to be one which makes it an obligation on the State to provide labour for the unemployed out of local funds and desire to extend it to public funds, and to be one intimately connected with the nationalisation of land. That is no description of the Government measure, and we do not, at all events, desire to carry out those principles. And if hon. Gentlemen consider that those principles are embodied in the Bill, it may well give other hon. Gentlemen, who do not agree with them in this, serious cause to pause. I believe that if more sober and wise counsels prevail, and if this Bill were treated as a machinery Bill, and amended so as to become a machinery Bill, it is not impossible that some arrangement might be made to pass it as an uncontroversial measure.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: Do I understand that the right hon. Gentleman is prepared to bring influence to bear upon those who are opposing the measure on his own side?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not propose to try to influence one side more than the other. If hon. Gentlemen opposite are prepared to treat it as a mere machinery Bill, and if it be amended as a machinery Bill, I think it possible that we might be able to pass it in the present session. Otherwise, I have no hope of its being passed.

Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): When the right hon. Gentlemen says "a machinery Bill," what part of the Bill does he propose to drop?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I ought to have notice of that Question; but I may say at once, without futher reference to the measure, that evidently that part would have to be dropped which enables labour to be paid for out of the rates.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Is it not a fact that all the opposition to that part of the Bill which is now proposed to be dropped comes from some five or six Members on the Government side ["No"] headed by the Member for Chelsea; and will the Prime Minister bring his influence to bear on those Members to withdraw their opposition.

Mr. LOUGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to put down the Amendments which he thinks necessary in order to enable the Bill to pass?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, I have already stated that that must be a matter of arrangement between the contending critics of the Bill as it stands. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil has described the Bill, I think, or rather misdescribed it, as one which makes it obligatory on the Government to provide labour for unskilled workmen, and said that we should always have the unemployed in our midst as long as private property in land is permitted. If those are the principles embodied or embedded in the Bill, I venture to think there is not the slightest chance of the Bill passing this session, or any session, in which the present Government, and I suspect other Governments, have control over the public business of this House.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: Is it because of opinions which I am supposed to hold or to have expressed that the Government is now going to drop the Bill? As a point of personal explanation let me assure the right hon. Gentleman that although I hold strongly that so long as land and capital are private property we are bound to have the unemployed with us, I have welcomed the Bill, not because it would compel the local authorities to provide work, but because it provides the means whereby the local authorities might provide work for those who would otherwise starve.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): May I asked whether, as this is a Government Bill, the Prime Minister is prepared to use the power he possesses to push his own Bill through the House of Commons, and never mind what interpretation we put on it? If he does, we will lend him all the help we can.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is one of those who have certainly not assisted the Government in pushing on their own Bills in the past. ["Oh!"] It will be found, for instance, that the hon. Gentleman voted against the closuring Resolutions of the Aliens Bill.

Mr. CROOKS: Yes, Sir.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman was quite right from his own point of view, and I am not quarrelling with him; but the hon. Gentleman can hardly complain that I do not necessarily welcome him as an ally on the point of public business.

Mr. CROOKS: The Government must remember that they would not have got the Second Reading of their Bill but for my intervention, and therefore they did welcome me as an ally. I ask the Prime Minister whether that miserable abortion the Redistribution Resolution—["Order"]—is to take the place of an important piece of legislation which has caused most of the labour men worry and trouble for the last twelve or fourteen years. Let me say publicly and openly —— ["Order."]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must put what he has to say in the form of an interrogation and not of a speech.

Mr. CROOKS: Then will the right hon. Gentleman move that I be suspended from the service of this House if I object to every piece of legislation until we get satisfaction over the Unemployed Bill?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am sorry the hon. Gentleman thinks so ill of the Redistribution Resolutions I would remind him that at a meeting which he attended last Saturday the Bill was described as a Bill that was not worth much.

Mr. CROOKS: Not by me.

Mr. BROADHURST (Leicester): Is it not reasonable that we should be told what portions of the Bill the Government now consider it necessary to omit in order to get the Bill?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have stated the lines on which, and on which alone, I think there is any chance of passing this Bill. Whether those lines will be accepted on both sides of the House I have at present no knowledge. I can only suggest the general principles on which an arrangement might be made.

Redistribution.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a Question with reference to order and procedure. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board has placed on the Paper a notice of a Resolution dealing with the question of Redistribution. That Resolution is a long and complicated one and contains within itself a scheme of Redistribution, and it is put forward with the intention of founding a Bill upon it if passed. I wish to ask you whether in cases such as this the invariable precedent has not been for the Government to move that the House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering such Resolutions, the object being, of course, that on that Motion the general discussion shall take place. Then, when the House went into Committee on the Resolutions, they could be dealt with clause by clause, just as on the Committee stage of the Bill. I am aware there is no exact precedent, and that the action of the Government in this matter is, in fact, unprecedented; but the nearest precedents I am aware of are, first, one in 1858 with regard to the Government of India Bill, when, under the Government of Lord Derby, a Resolution was moved that the House do resolve itself into a Committee to consider certain Resolutions upon which it was intended to found a Bill. Secondly, in 1868, in reference to the disestablishment of the Irish Church, Mr. Gladstone's procedure was to move that the House do resolve itself into a Committee to consider several Resolutions, which were taken up *seriatim*. The particular point I have in my mind is this, that if the present unprecedented procedure is adopted it is quite conceivable that, after a general discussion on, say, the first Amendment possible, it may be impossible afterwards to take up the clauses of this long and complicated scheme in the Resolution clause by clause and discuss it, as we should in Committee on a Bill. I submit this, Sir, as a question of order and procedure and ask your guidance.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I was not aware that the hon. Member was going to raise this point, or I would have fortified myself with full information in advance. The rule of the House in dealing with Resolutions is quite clear—that is to say, the ordinary rule obtains, that each Member can only speak once, and no Amendments are reserved. The only cases in which Amendments are reserved are the cases of Bills in Committee, Bills on Report, or Resolutions dealing with the procedure of the House, taking the time of the House, so-called guillotine Resolutions, and the like. Therefore, if an Amendment were put down to leave out all the words after the word "That" in order to insert some reasoned Amendment against the Resolution, and if that Amendment were negatived, then the whole of the Resolution would stand, and no Amendments would be possible. That is the ordinary rule of procedure. Of course it is open to hon. Members whether they choose to take that particular method of meeting the Resolution or other methods. With regard to the question whether the Resolutions should be referred to a

Committee or not, I am afraid I have not got the first precedent which the hon. Member cited in my mind; but with regard to the second precedent—namely, the referring of the Resolutions relating to the Irish Church to a Committee—that was done under the old Standing Order which compelled all questions which dealt with religious matters to be considered in Committee of the Whole House. That Standing Order is now abolished, and for that reason it would not be compulsory, if any similar Resolutions were introduced, to discuss them in Committee.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I ought to apologise for not having given you notice, Sir, but it was impossible to engage your attention during Questions. My point is, not that it is compulsory—I do not say at all that it is compulsory—on the Government; but I hope to elicit an expression of opinion from you that to follow a procedure which, according to what you have now said, will preclude the possibility of dealing in Committee with the complicated details of this scheme, and which will confine the discussion to a general Second Reading discussion, is a procedure not suited to a case of this kind, and one which ought not to be followed. Perhaps the Prime Minister will say something to relieve the House from the apprehension, which I think now will be general, that this House after a Second Reading discussion will have forced upon it, perhaps by the closure, a Resolution which is in effect a long and complicated scheme the details of which have not been considered.

*Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: On the point of order, Sir, if this Resolution be presented to the House, I submit to you that by the rules of the House it will have to be broken up into eleven separate Resolutions—for there are in it eleven separate, distinct propositions. This is according to the ancient rules of this House, beginning with the time when the Speaker himself formulated the Question and put it in his own words to the House. The same question arose, only in a much less acute form, with reference to a Resolution which my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury proposed in January, 1902, and which embodied two distinct, separate propositions. I then appealed to the Speaker, without any notice, and claimed that the Resolution must be divided into two, inasmuch as it contained two separate propositions, and Mr. Speaker Gully ruled that I was right. Accordingly he did divide the Resolution into two, and he did put it in two Questions. I submit confidently that when there are separate and distinct propositions in a Resolution, the Resolution must be divided into as many Resolutions as there are in it separate and distinct propositions, and that each must be put separately to the House, in order that the House may be enabled to exercise its undoubted right to assent to one alone while dissenting, if it so desires, from all the others.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not unwilling, of course, that there should be a general discussion on the Resolution. But I am unwilling that the forms of the House should be used to prolong that discussion to an impossible length.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I did not say that.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not making any charge against the hon. Gentleman. I am only explaining my own position. I should be glad to come to an amicable arrangement with hon. Gentlemen opposite if such an arrangement is possible.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): That hardly meets the point, which concerns us all. The right hon. Gentleman is willing, apparently, to make some arrangement whereby there should be no undue curtailment of the general discussion upon the Resolution as a whole. But what we require is the power, after such general debate, of discussing, if necessary, the details of the Resolution; because we are told that the Resolution will practically be a Bill, and that we shall be short of a large amount of our powers when a further Bill is introduced to carry it into effect if we have committed ourselves to this extremely detailed Resolution. I join most cordially in the appeal to the right hon. Gentleman that, in a matter so enormously important as this, so urgent and complicated, he should perhaps between this and Monday think of some way to give the House that liberty to which it is entitled, and which, in one form or another, it will insist upon having.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the right hon. Gentleman is under some misapprehension. He supposes that it would be impossible for the House to discuss the subject of this Resolution in detail when the Bill to be founded on it is introduced. The House will have absolute freedom to deal with the details of that Bill. No power is taken away from the House by this Resolution. All we seek now is the power to give such instructions to the Boundary Commissioners as that they will be able to prepare a Bill for the consideration of the House, and the House will have full freedom to reject that Bill or amend it or do anything they like with it. As regards the particular procedure to be adopted in the case of the Resolution, I am quite willing to see by Monday if I can meet the views of the House. I do not know with what kind of opposition the Resolution is to be meet. But I suggest that it is hardly fair, if I am to give up every instrument which I possess to press on the business of the Government, hon. Gentlemen opposite are to retain every weapon which they possess.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: We will give up no weapon, any way.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not complaining. I am only saying that it is somewhat unreasonable that the hon. Gentleman should come forward and state publicly that there is no weapon of delay which he is prepared to give up, but I am to give up any weapon which I may possess for expediting business.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I thought the right hon. Gentleman was Leader of the House. He speaks now of the weapons he possesses as against the House. I am obliged to remind the right hon. Gentleman that, great as his position and powers are, the House is greater; and the House in a case like this, where we have a great constitutional change to consider, is entitled not only to all the latitude of discussion and the powers of criticism which the rules allow, but even to any extension of those rules that may be necessary in order to give us the power required.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman has reminded me of something. I will remind him of something. It was only two days ago that he reproached me with not having forwarded the business of the House with more rapidity, by which, of course, he meant, and could only have meant, that I had not used all the powers which, according to him, I possess.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I have made no request to the right hon. Gentleman to give up any weapon, as he calls it; but I have asked that this Resolution should be treated, according to precedent, in such a way as that the House can discuss its details. It is no answer to tell me that the details can be discussed on the Bill next year. My objection is against the passing of a Bill in the form of a Resolution this year without discussion. The hon. Member for King's Lynn has made, as he always makes in these matters, a good point. He has submitted the question whether it is competent in the form of one Resolution to put to the House a number of separate and different propositions. Therefore, Sir, I have to ask you, on a point of order, whether these eleven propositions will be put separately from the Chair, or whether they will be put, according to this method, as a weapon in the hands of the Government in one Motion, thereby precluding the possibility of discussing the details. One word more, I did not use the words "weapon of delay" which the right hon. Gentleman put into my mouth. The phrase I would wish to use is "weapon of defence." The right hon. Gentleman's weapon is a weapon of aggression.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: On the point of order. Is it not the fact that, in the case of the Resolution alluded to by my hon. friend behind me, there were two quite separate and distinct proposals therein contained, whereas in the scheme of the Government the general plan hangs together, and it is impossible to divide it?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that instead of answering immediately this very grave point, in which I entirely agree with the hon. Member for King's Lynn, you should take steps to inform yourself from any memoranda existing of the private rulings on this question which have been given by previous Speakers? This is a matter which has seldom been ruled on publicly, because such points in doubtful cases have been submitted to the Chair in advance. I am aware of two cases, in one of which I was personally concerned, and in the other Mr. Gladstone, in which the Resolutions were divided, and in regard to which I know private rulings were given. Will you take steps to inform yourself of those private decisions?

*MR SPEAKER: This obviously is a very important question, and I think, if the House will permit me, I would rather take time to consider it. As the Question stands on the Paper it would seem to impose upon me, if I were to accept the suggestion which has been made, the necessity of drafting some ten or twelve fresh Questions. That is one of the points which I must consider, and I will take every available means of discovering what has been done when similar questions have arisen in the past.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: May I remind you, Sir, that Sir Erskine May on this point says that, although one individual Member cannot perhaps claim to have a complicated Question divided into its component parts, the House can always order it to be so divided?

The incident then terminated.

SUPPLY [14TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1905-6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,220,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Capitation Grants and Miscellaneous Charges of Volunteer Corps, including Pay, etc., of the Permanent Staff, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on March 31st, 1906."

*MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) welcomed this opportunity of considering the question of the Volunteers as a separate issue. The question of the treatment of the Volunteers by the War Office was not a Party question. The popular feeling which had been aroused by recent events in connection with the Volunteers showed that the country would not stand idly by if there was any further attempt at the extinction of the force which, in spite of years of ridicule and discouragement and intimidation, and notwithstanding what was stated in the circular of June 20th, had increased both in numbers and efficiency. The country wanted to know why these attempts were being continuously made to impose impossible conditions upon the Volunteer force. The object evidently was to pave the way for something else which might not be openly advocated or acknowledged. They were very glad of the help of the Volunteers in the dark days of the war. Nobly had they been rewarded for their services! No doubt the generals who saw them in the field had paid generous tributes to the services rendered by the Volunteers, but he made bold to say that the War Office and the Secretary of State for War had minimised the services which the Volunteers then rendered. The reward had been that since that time they had been hustled and harried. This treatment was all the more galling and contemptible when they considered that the process of strangulation was being carried on under the hypocritical disguise of increasing their efficiency. The latest move was the circular to which he had already referred. It was a mere incident. It was simply a move in the game. When he put a Question to the Secretary of State for War a week last Monday he said there were no new regulations. Technically the right hon. Gentleman was right, but the Answer was rather misleading the House as to what had been done. Since then there had been two explanatory letters of the circular, in one of which the right hon. Gentleman said the circular was quite clear, and last night they got a revised edition of the circular. Most people considered that the right hon. Gentleman had by that amended edition raised the white flag; but he had not surrendered.

He should like for a moment to consider the circular. It was divided into two parts. It asked that the Volunteers should be divided into two classes. Paragraph 5, in the delicate language so characteristic of the right hon. Gentleman, asked commanding officers to divide their force into fit and unfit. He would like to point out that this definition was retained in the amended edition of the circular. He would also point out that there was nothing in the original circular as to service abroad. It was only after this matter had been referred to in the Press, and a reply had been given to a Question which he put to him, that the right hon. Gentleman mentioned service abroad. He made bold to say that when the circular was issued the conditions therein defined were meant for home service, and that obviously this question of service abroad was an afterthought. The right hon. Gentleman had availed himself of that to provide a means of retreat, but he challenged the right hon. Gentleman to ask each commanding officer what was the interpretation he put on that circular when it came under his observation. Commanding officers were, he thought, men of average intelligence, and he made bold to say that 99 out of 100 would reply that they read the circular in that light. He would go further and say that if this circular had not been disclosed to the public those conditions would have been insisted on and carried into effect. He could not understand the reason why the Government should so shrink from publicity in this matter. That document was marked "Confidential," but he said that the Press had done a national service in making its terms public.

He would like the Committee for a moment to consider what it meant. The right hon. Gentleman said it was for information only. If this was an Order merely for information there need be no secrecy at all about its issue. The returns undoubtedly ought to have been kept a secret, and would have been kept secret, but if it was merely an inquiry for information he did not see why it should be issued in the form of a confidential document. He asked the Committee whether anything could be more grossly insulting than to ask a commanding officer to divide his battalion into fit and unfit. [Laughter.] He did not think hon. Gentlemen would laugh when they considered the standard to be applied. He wanted to bring this home to the Secretary of State for War.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Where do you find that statement? The circular asked commanding officers to state all those who were fit for active service abroad.

*MR. McCRAE: Paragraph 5 says that the report should show the number of men in each corps who were fit and unfit.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The hon. Member will see that that sentence relates to what has gone before.

MR. McCRAE said that in the original circular it could not relate to active service abroad. Supposing that for information only they wished to inquire as to the fitness or unfitness of Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench, that they divided them into two classes, and supposing that they applied the first standard, and said that, instead of having the physical equivalent of nineteen years, they should have the mental equivalent of nineteen years, and supposing that their capitation grant was to be cut down by one-half in the case of hon. Members who fell short of the nineteen years, what would they do? He knew what the Volunteers would do. They would at once resign. He would like to point out that, notwithstanding the amended form of the circular, general officers commanding districts were asked to report as to the Volunteer units they proposed to disband or amalgamate. If this circular was issued to find out how many men were fit to go on active service abroad, why should this be mixed up in the same circular with other matters? The more the circular was examined the more extraordinary it became. There were two conditions, first the physical test, and secondly expertness with the rifle. Paragraph 4 of the original circular said, "In addition to the above, men reported as fit for active service, should be first-class shots." That was the test applied to Volunteers, but not to the Regulars during the South African War. If this circular had any meaning at all it meant that that test was to be applied, and that the different battalions were to be divided into two classes. If it meant anything else, then all he could say was that this circular was as loosely drawn as any contract for the sale of surplus stores in South Africa. The physical standard which the right hon. Gentleman applied to the Volunteers was higher than that which he was going to apply to the home-service Army when brought into being. In regard to the shooting regulation, the Answer given to-day, supplemented by another Answer which was given to a Question which he put to the right hon. Gentleman, was that some of the Volunteer battalions had no first-class shots at all, because they were under the old conditions, and had only marksmen, second-class, and third-class shots. That was a mere technical point, but it showed how absurd the whole proceedings had been. He would go further and say that this circular was a breach of the Volunteer Regulations, which laid down definitely with regard to shooting that any regulation should not be in excess of the requirements for the soldier in the same arm of the service.

But this circular, after all, was merely an eruption. It showed the bad state of the blood. It was symptomatic of the disease, and must be taken in conjunction with the declared policy of the Secretary of State for War in regard to the Volunteers. His policy was divided into two heads. The first was the reduction of the Volunteer force, altogether apart from the question of efficiency. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would not deny that, because on July 14th, speaking in this House, he said—

> "I propose, therefore, to fix the establishment of the Volunteers at 200,000 men and to reduce the strength by absorption, in the first instance to 180,000 men."

The present establishment of the Volunteers was 344,000, and if the original proposal had been carried out that would have meant a reduction of 114,000 men. The present actual strength of the Volunteer force was 245,000. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to reduce them to 180,000, a reduction of 65,000. Under the second head he proposed to divide the Volunteer force into two classes. If the Committee had followed his argument they would find that the circular conformed to both these conditions of the right hon. Gentleman's policy. He thought a very serious aspect of the question was that the House of Commons repudiated the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman both in regard to reduction and classification, and on the Army Estimates which were considered in this House on April 5th it was only by the intervention of the Prime Minister, backed up by the benevolent self-denial of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham, that the Government was saved from defeat on this Vote. The Prime Minister on that occasion threw over the Secretary of State for War, who proposed to reduce the grant to the Volunteers by £300,000—a reduction of one-fourth of the total amount. But the First Lord of the Treasury said, "Oh no, we are going to spend that amount in extra efficiency grant." The fact of the matter was that the right hon. Gentleman dare not carry out his policy in the open, and, therefore, means secret and subterranean had been resorted to in this circular to carry it out. His policy was already condemned.

This policy of gradual extinction was worthy of the Spanish Inquisition. It was initiated by the late Secretary of State for War, who nearly destroyed the British Army. The present Secretary of State for War said at Edinburgh last December that if the three years system adopted by his predecessor had been continued the British infantry as a fighting force would have ceased to exist. The late Secretary of State for War also "tried his 'prentice hand" on the Volunteers. He produced impossible camp regulations with regard to them. These were afterwards modified, if not withdrawn, but not until mischief had been done, and after corps had been depleted of their best men. These camp regulations caused men of splendid physique to send in their resignations, and their places had not been filled in many battalions, notably the Metropolitan battalions. He understood the Artist Corps, which used to turn out 1,200 at inspection, only turned out 500 the other day. In other corps they had kept up the numbers by accepting men of a lower physical standard. Then came the present Secretary of State for War, who said they were going to introduce medical tests. The medical tests were for fitness for service abroad. What right had the right hon. Gentleman to apply that test to a force which had been raised for home service? It was an invidious distinction to classify any battalion under the heads of fit and unfit, with regard to service abroad—a condition which they never undertook to fulfil. He could not help thinking that this was an attempt to smash up the Volunteer force and pave the way for conscription. If this had been a medical test for home service it would have been a different thing. But, as the right hon. Gentleman knew, every recruit was medically examined before he was enrolled. But the right hon. Gentleman, in a letter to an hon. Member, gave utterance to this doctrine—

> "The law of deterioration is not confined to the Volunteer. It is common to mankind."

That was a very profound doctrine. He did not know whether it would apply to His Majesty's Government. He knew that it had been a popular idea that when a young fellow got into the Volunteers they rather increased his physical fitness, and that he did not deteriorate. The Queen's Edinburgh Rifle Volunteers had a strength of 2,400 men. Was it a small matter to ask the whole of the regiment to be medically examined on the off chance of some men volunteering for service abroad? He found that an hon. Member of this House had been written to by a colonel commanding an English Volunteer corps who had received a letter of resignation from the medical officer of his battalion because the proposed examination would take so much of the medical officer's time. That medical officer refused to make the examination unless he was paid. He regretted having to resign, but said there was no other course left open for him. All those things had evidently been under the consideration of the Army Council. Let the right hon. Gentleman make no mistake. The Volunteers did not object to serve under a high standard of efficiency, but the standard should be one for home service; and let it be limited by the demands of the Volunteer's daily employment. If anyone considered the progress which the Volunteer force had made during the past twenty years, he would acknowledge that the nation had no cause to complain, either as to efficiency or cost. The complaint had been made that the Volunteer cost £7 a year, and the War Office expected as much service and efficiency from him as from the ordinary soldier who cost £70 a year. But now they even demanded a higher standard from the Volunteers than from the Regular Army.

He, and those who agreed with him, challenged the policy of the circular of the Secretary of State for War. Would the right hon. Gentleman assure the Committee that this circular had nothing to do with his scheme, first, to reduce the Volunteer force, and second, to divide the Volunteer force into two classes? And, further, would the right hon. Gentleman undertake that no reduction of the force, no division into classes, should take place, that no change whatever should be made in the conditions of service without the express sanction of this House? They did not want a renewal of the two abortive attempts to shatter the Volunteer force. He used the words advisedly. Where did the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman now stand. What was wanted was a clear statement. They wanted to know what the right hon. Gentleman proposed to do with the Volunteers; what part he expected them to play in the scheme of home defence—not for service abroad. Was the right hon. Gentleman surprised at that? He put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman the other day as to service abroad, and the right hon. Gentleman gave him no Answer. They wanted to put an end, once for all, to this uncertainty. They wanted to put a stop to this policy of continual nagging. Changing conditions, even if they were practical, were inimical to the efficiency of the force. And if anything was to be done, do not let it be done in the dark.

Now, this recent policy of the War Office had done infinite harm to the Volunteer force; it had done much to sterilise that patriotic enthusiasm on which the nation must depend in the hour of danger. The War Office had neglected obvious reforms, such as the constitution of Volunteer divisions and the Army Service Corps scheme for the Volunteers. Money had been voted for the latter on the Estimates for the last two years; but it had not been carried out. On the contrary, the War Office had adopted a destructive policy instead of a constructive policy. What was wanted was to restore confidence in the Volunteer ranks, and they asked the War Office to withdraw the circular which had been promulgated without thought and framed without knowledge. The right hon. Gentleman's policy rested on an entirely wrong foundation. That policy—he thought Lord Roberts was the first to initiate it—was "a small, highly-trained Volunteer force." That was altogether wrong. Our endeavour should be to encourage the Volunteer service, and to give as many men as possible a certain degree of military training. He should have thought that that would have appealed to hon. Members who were in favour of universal military service; and why did they not support it? It was because they realised that the Volunteers stood between this country and conscription. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War dilated in one of his letters, with unctuous rectitude, and at great length, as to the intentions and motives of the Army Council. They would judge the right hon. Gentleman and the Army Council by their actions; and it would be found—if the right hon. Gentleman had not discovered it beforehand—that the Volunteers, while giving valuable although gratuitous service to the State, were heartily sick of this treatment; and that they did not intend to be the shuttlecock of any War Minister. He begged to move.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,219,900, be granted for the said Service."

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said it was very important that this matter should be kept as free as possible from Party politics; and in rising to support the Motion of the hon. Member for East Edinburgh he truly believed that hon. Members on both sides of the House who would support that Motion were not animated by any feeling of hostility, personal or Party, to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. The hon. Gentleman who moved the Motion had drawn attention to the very serious condition of things, which had been going on for some time, with reference to the Auxiliary Forces. The incident which had called forth the Motion of the hon. Gentleman opposite was mainly the circular issued on 20th June last. He could not understand with what object that circular was issued, or what advantage it could possibly have when issued. It might possibly have been excused if some great war were imminent; but the ordinary man in the street did not think that there was such a lamentable state of things. Even if war were imminent, the information required by the circular would be out of date within three months, and the whole of the trouble which had been put on the officers of the Volunteer force and on the medical officers would be absolutely useless.

Then, had the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War any authority or right to issue such a circular? Was it possible to give power to the Secretary for War to issue a circular, and within a fortnight withdraw it and issue another amending circular, which, though marked 'Confidential,' appeared the next day in the newspapers? What were the conditions of Volunteer service? They were that—

> "In case of imminent national danger or of great emergency (the occasion being first communicated to both Houses of Parliament, if Parliament is sitting, or declared in Council, and notified by Proclamation if Parliament is not sitting) His Majesty may call out the Volunteer corps of the respective counties, or any of them, for actual military service."

Evidently no such condition of affairs existed at the present time. The right hon. Gentleman wanted a medical examination of the Volunteer force. Was he not aware that, under Regulation 119 for the Volunteer Force for 1901—

> "Every candidate for enrolment will be required to pass a physical examination by a medical officer of the corps."

These returns were submitted to the War Office, and the right hon. Gentleman had only to ask for an analysis of these returns in order to give him all the information he required. Again, who was to pay the expense of this examination? Was the right hon. Gentleman to issue an order that the sergeant in charge of the battalion was to sound the bugle-call so that he might obtain the information? He had had a communication from the commanding officer of a Volunteer regiment, who said that it would be impossible to examine more than four men in an hour. Take a regiment of 400 men, that meant that the medical man would have to spend 100 hours in this medical examination for the information of the Secretary of State for War. He noticed that the circular had been put in much better terms in the version which appeared in that morning's papers; but it was a great pity that it had not originally been issued in these terms.

He could not understand who it was that drafted the War Office circulars. He could not bring himself to believe that it was the military members of the Army Council who were responsible. They were the Adjutant-General, the Quartermaster-General, the Chief of the Staff, and others and he could not believe that they ever consented to the issue of such a circular. The Adjutant-General had been an adjutant of a Volunteer corps quite recently, and he might have known the extraordinary effect which that circular would produce in Volunteer circles. General Kitt had been connected with the Auxiliary Forces and had commanded in the field, and he maintained that, if a circular such as this was issued to the Volunteer and Auxiliary Forces without the Director of the Auxiliary Forces being called into consultation with the Army Council, t was a most unsatisfactory and unfortunate state of things. In 1901 600 officers and 20,000 Volunteers came back from active service in the field in South Africa, and a circular was issued asking "If the Volunteers wished to be taken seriously!" He knew perfectly well who was the author of that circular. He was an officer who was retained at the headquarters in defiance of all rules and regulations that had been made as to the headquarters staff since 1898. He had always refrained from mentioning his name before, but he must do it now. It was Colonel Adye. He did not say that that officer was the author of this circular; but he was the author of the circular of 1901 which had to be withdrawn. And that officer was the only officer of all those connected with the great disaster at Nicholson's Nek in South Africa who had not been punished. He did not say that that officer was the author of this circular; but, at any rate, the style of it was much the same as that of the circular of 1901. He was not going to labour this matter; but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War would be better advised in the future; and that he would withdraw the circular. Everybody made mistakes, and the right hon. Gentleman should admit that he had made one on this occasion.

His hon. friend who moved the Resolution had rightly said that this circular was only an incident in the career of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. He, himself, was animated with the most friendly feeling for the right hon. Gentleman; indeed he was one of the first to congratulate him by telegram on his appointment to his present high office. The right hon. Gentleman had said recently that the Volunteers would always find in him a most sympathetic defender of the Volunteer force. But how cruelly had the Volunteers been disappointed in him! The right hon. Gentleman had shown an extraordinary method of exhibiting that friendship and sympathy. What was the position of affairs? The right hon. Gentleman had been in office for eighteen months or two years. He had had in his hands the Report on the Norfolk Royal Commision—a Commission which had called eighty-two witnesses and had held 130 odd sittings, and which placed in his hands a series of propositions. What had the right hon. Gentleman done with that Report? It was common knowledge that the right hon. Gentleman had done nothing to give effect to the recommendations of that Royal Commission. There was not an officer or a private in the whole Volunteer force who was not willing to aid the Secretary of State in any reasonable manner to improve the condition of the force. What did the Royal Commission say?—

> "The Volunteer force owes its origin and continuance mainly to the energy and goodwill of its officers and men, and the fact that it does not attain to the standard imposed by war conditions is in no way attributable to them."

If the right hon. Gentleman had read that passage on page 9 he would at once have said that it depended on the War Office to put the Volunteer force into a proper state of efficiency. It was not possible, with the limited time at their disposal, to go into the whole of the Report of the Royal Commission, but there were one or two passages to which he would like to call attention; for instance, the Report said—

> "The training of the Volunteers is carried on under considerable difficulties as to both time and space, and is in many cases especially hampered by the want of easily accessible ranges. The efficiency of the different units varies greatly, and some reach a high level, but taking the force as a whole neither the musketry nor the tactical training of the rank and file would enable it to face with prospect of success the troops of a Continental army. The Volunteer Artillery lacks the requisite training and mobility. The transport, equipment, and artillery *matériel* of the Volunteer force are far from satisfactory."

The right hon. Gentleman had dealt with that by taking away the only guns they had and sending down a whole army of artificers to alter and improve them until the result was that in the opinion of experts it was dangerous to fire them at all. The Report continued—

> "The only attempt at organising the Volunteer force in the *cadres* required for war has been the grouping of the infantry battalions in brigades. Certain battalions are picked out from these brigades to form other brigades in the field army, and no less than twenty-six Volunteer battalions are shown in the Army List as belonging at the same time to two different brigades. These Army field brigades have no permanently appointed commanders. Of the others, some are broken up on mobilisation, and their peace organisation does not correspond with their war duties. Some are under the command of the officer commanding the regimental district, who has many other duties, especially on mobilisation. Four are under officers commanding the regiments of the Guards, and the remainder are during the week's camp under the command of a brigadier who has no authority over them at other times. There is no divisional organisation, nor are any arrangements made for the command and staffs of large masses of Volunteers of the various arms told off to the defence of London, beyond the grouping of the infantry brigades as already mentioned."

Sir Howard Vincent.

He submitted that, when this document came before him, his right hon. friend and the Army Council had a definite task to discharge. With very little difficulty and trouble they could have corrected this deficiency in the Volunteer force. But had anything been done in that direction? Absolutely nothing. And in his opinion this was attributable entirely to his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War making speeches in derision of the force and in derision of the contribution they made to the South African forces, and it was only natural in those circumstances that nobody under him would do anything. The hon. Member who brought forward this Motion spoke of the losses which the force had suffered in officers and men. From 1900 to the present time a large number of officers had sent in their resignations, and there had been a loss of 34,000 men, but had anything been done by the right hon. Gentleman or anyone under him to obtain officers for the Volunteer force? Had anything been done to give the force confidence or to reorganise it for war under officers who would not be taken away to other duties on the declaration of war, but who would be responsible for their brigades in times of peace and in the field in time of war? Nothing had been done. What had been done was to make declarations deriding the assistance given by the Volunteers in South Africa and deriding their efficiency. The inspecting officer saw every man individually at times of inspection, and it was the duty of that officer to make a report which ultimately came into the hands of the Secretary of State, who should communicate with the commanding officer upon the subject. If a regiment was inefficient, it was the fault of the commanding officer;

but nothing had been done in that matter. He had a letter from a commanding officer who told him that the sending out of a circular was merely urnishing the Secretary of State for War with ammunition for further sarcasms.

The state of affairs was very serious indeed. The Prime Minister, as President of the Defence Committee, said only the other day that in 1899 and 1900 they had a great mass of Volunteers, but no means of organisation by which they might be utilised. Lord Roberts, in another place, recently said also that the condition of this force was worse than it was in 1899. The right hon. Gentleman was the only man connected with the administration of the Army who had not approved of the Volunteer force in the slightest degree. Lord Roberts in a letter said the lesson of the South African War had been learnt in America, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and that legislative measures had been passed to deal with this matter. Had the right hon. Gentleman done anything to form a strong force? At the outbreak of the South African War 35 per cent. of the Regular Army were unable to embark either from being under age or from medical inefficiency. These were vital headquarter matters but why should the right hon. Gentleman waste his time and the finances of the country and upset the whole Volunteer force by retaining it in its present state of uncertainty. Unless there was some satisfactory information to-night and an undertaking from the right hon. Gentleman that he would not persevere in this ridiculous course, and that during the recess no attempt would be made to take any step with the object of cutting down the force, he would have to vote for this Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman had no right to carry out these ideas of his own against the will of the representatives of the people, and unless the right hon. Gentleman could give the assurance asked for he should vote for this Amendment, because he believed the Volunteer force was necessary to this country as a barrier between this country and that conscription which the right hon. Gentleman favoured. There had been no declaration so far on the part of the right hon. Gentleman of his views with regard to conscription.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes. In this House I have made a public declaration that I am strongly opposed to it.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT expressed his gratification at the definite declaration of the right hon. Gentleman, and said he thought that this debate had well occupied the time of the House even if nothing else resulted from it. He earnestly hoped his right hon. friend would pardon him if he had used any expressions he should not have used in the heat of the debate. He was animated with the most friendly feelings towards his right hon. friend, and he was only urging him to take the course which he (Sir Howard Vincent) believed was best for himself, best for the Government, and best for the Party to which he belonged.

*MR. C. R. SPENCER (Northamptonshire, Mid.) said he felt justified in asking the Committee to allow him to say a few words upon the Volunteer question, although he had spoken upon it on a previous occasion, because something very serious had recently happened and he felt bound, as a Member of Parliament, to express his opinion on the two circulars issued recently by the right hon. Gentleman's Department. The position of the Volunteers at present was a very serious one, and it was the bounden duty of everyone who had the interests of the force at heart to speak out with no uncertain voice and to say what he thought should be done to assist the Volunteer force. This was a question which had a very great interest for the country at large, because it not only affected the well-being of the constitution of the Auxiliary Forces but also the country as a whole for if these circulars were allowed to be continued there was a fear that this one great rampart which protected us from the evils from which foreign countries suffered would be removed. He, therefore, would oppose everything that might end in almost the ruin of the Volunteer force. The right hon. Gentleman would forgive him saying that he did not think the right hon. Gentleman had improved at all in his knowledge of the Volunteers. If the right hon. Gentleman had learnt a little more of the feelings and the wishes of the Volunteer forces he would not have embarrassed them with the circulars that had been referred to, and would not have allowed that force to be worried and harried until large numbers had been forced out of the force altogether.

He himself believed that the Volunteer force could be brought up to a state of efficiency if regard was had to its conditions of service. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to have forgotten that the Volunteers were Volunteers, and that no amount of screwing, by circular or otherwise, could raise or, as he would prefer to put it, lower good Volunteers into sham Regulars. He disapproved of the harassing of the Volunteers, and strongly protested against the additional worry recently entailed by the medical examination. It was impossible for the medical officers, without extra remuneration, especially in country battalions, many of whose members lived at great distances from headquarters, to go about medically examining under the new circular. "Faulty teeth" were referred to in that document. Everybody, whether civilian or military man, knew that faulty teeth were a great hindrance to the comfortable carrying out of the duties of life, but in these days, when Volunteers were not required to bite off the ends of their cartridges, he thought it was really unnecessary to set up a difficulty about faulty teeth or the number of teeth possessed by Volunteers. If the Army Council or the right hon. Gentleman laid down the requisite number of teeth a Volunteer was to have to ensure proper mastication, the further difficulty would immediately arise as to who was to decide which teeth were thoroughly sound and which not. Then there was the question of age. That was always a delicate matter to discuss either in or out of Parliament. Doubtless the right hon. Gentleman, like himself, would gladly recall his forty-fourth birthday. But he did not consider that the fact of a man's being forty-five years of age was any bar to his performing good and efficient service as a Volunteer. The enforcement of that condition would deal a heavy blow to the Volunteer force, because in many battalions the backbone of the regiment were men of forty-five who had been in the battalion fifteen or twenty years, understood the discipline, and encouraged the younger members to follow in the proper course.

What was the object of the circular? It was said to be economy. Laudable economy was to be strongly supported, but there was such a thing as ill-judged parsimony, and he greatly feared that the action of the right hon. Gentleman would cost the country millions if hereafter—which heaven forbid—there was demanded from the population of this country an armed force to resist invasion. Was this the policy of His Majesty's Government with regard to the Volunteers? Was the Government going to follow what he conceived to be the fatal guidance of the Secretary of State, and, ignoring the valuable services rendered by them in the late war, regard the Volunteers as a force which could not be taken seriously? Was the Government going to support the Volunteers or not? It was time the Volunteers had that question answered. Already there were unmistakable signs that the force was getting discouraged. Some of the great London battalions, the pride of the Metropolis, had been considerably reduced, and an end ought to be put to the present uncertainty at once. Was it the policy of His Majesty's Government permanently to reduce the Volunteer force? If so, the Volunteers would know where they stood. The deputation of the National Guard of America which recently visited this country were horrified at the disregard and contempt with which the Volunteers were treated by the Government. Why was it the National Guard occupied the position it did in America? As far as he could understand, they were more or less the counterpart of the Volunteers here; they had taken across the Atlantic the hatred which we shared of conscription on European models; and, like our Volunteers, they regarded themselves as the strongest rampart against the adoption of a policy of conscription. In all sincerity and friendliness, he asked the Secretary of State to pause long before he enforced his immature schemes against the Volunteers. But if the right hon. Gentleman turned a deaf ear to his cry, he would appeal with confidence to the House of Commons itself, from which all the power of the right hon. Gentleman was derived, to prevent the ruin of the Volunteers being consummated.

*COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) said there had been many debates on this subject; but all the arguments which had been put forward for the benefit of the Secretary of State for War appeared to have been thrown away. There were two aspects of the question—the sentimental and the practical. Human nature, being what it was, was not expected to offer or to anticipate gratitude. Whatever was done for one's country or kin should be done spontaneously from high motives, and nothing expected in return—and it was astounding with what unanimity the Volunteers had been paid in accordance with that principle. The sentimental grievance was powerful, but the practical one could be brought in in such a way that the Committee would sympathise with the Volunteers in the one and help them in the other. For more than forty years this country had enjoyed the services of a force which had stood between it and conscription. He feared that sometimes they had stood too successfully between the country and a proper system of military training; at any rate, they had given their best, and had proved that within the conditions of service of men who had to earn their living there could be given sufficient military training to render a War Office of any common sense whatever secure against the adoption of a policy of conscription. But for forty years what had they received? The same neglect, the same method of being ignored, the same statements in Parliament that whatever they did was not enough. However much they tried, they could not attain to the high standard of Pall Mall. He gave the Unionist Government the credit of having been the first to recognise the necessities of the Volunteers and to offer them the additional money they required, but if the Government were so certain that Volunteers were of use as to give them that money, why had they not consulted them? He did not blame the present Secretary of State any more than his predecessor or his successor; they were only ripples in the sand, and the tide swept them away. What he blamed was the permanent feeling that subsisted in those who really governed the military forces of the country in the War Office itself. Secretaries of State were friendly enough to the Volunteers before they went into office, but immediately they got there they came under influences which caused them to throw overboard their previous views on the matter.

What had the Volunteers left undone for which they were condemned? They were said to be so puny that they could not compare with the "Sons of Anak" found in our Line regiments. The hon. Member for East Edinburgh, the hon. Member for Central Sheffield, and himself were fair samples, and they had given twenty or thirty years service free, gratis, and for nothing, to their country. Then the War Office asked as to their teeth. "Were the miserable stumps that adorned the gums of the Auxiliaries to be compared with the rows of ivories of our Regulars, one smile from which was supposed to be sufficient for the destruction of the foe?" In other words the foreign service conditions were to be applied to the inspections of teeth of a home-service Army. That was the sort of rubbish to which they were treated from the War Office! Would it not have been far better for the Secretary of State to have gone to the Association of Volunteer Commanding Officers and have said, "Gentlemen, I am not quite satisfied with you, but if you will come and reason together with me I think we can manage to make you better than you are?" Every single officer would then have placed his experience and knowledge at the service of the right hon. Gentleman, and he would have got exactly the information he wanted. But that was not the way the War Office did its work; it was the way business men would have done it.

It was no use the War Office thinking they could do without the Volunteers. What happened in the South African War? Practically every available Regular was sent out of the country, leaving scores of thousands of useless men behind whom the War Office dare not send, and then the War Office came on the Militia and Volunteers. The Secretary of State had never yet given the correct figures of what the Volunteers did for the country in that campaign. His own battalion, for instance, was credited with 115 men. The terms of service were made most difficult; they had to be not under twenty or over forty-five years of age; they had to be unmarried, to have all their teeth, to be marksmen, to go out in companies. Instead of sending only 115 men his battalion sent 389 men to the front, the difference being accounted for by his men enlisting in the Regulars, Militia, and Yeomanry, of whom no notice was taken by the War Office in their calculations of the services rendered by the Volunteers. He repeated it was no use the War Office thinking they could do without the Volunteers. The South African War clearly proved that, and what would happen in the next war would be exactly what happened in the South African War—in less than six months the War Office would be begging for help from Auxiliaries, and they would get it again if they did not interfere and spoil the service now. What was going on at the present moment? They were to depend on the Regular Army, apparently, for the defence of these shores, and upon the Volunteers for foreign service. They were dealing with men who did not aspire to place themselves alongside the professional soldier; the Volunteers had to earn their bread and they did their training in their spare time. But were they, therefore, to be ridiculed? They gave their time to the country, and were they on that account to be despised and told that they were not being taken seriously. The Volunteers served a much bigger purpose than any mere training of men. He did not care whether a man were seventeen or seventy, if that man underwent regular training, was put under the discipline which a Volunteer regiment ought to give, and trained to shoot, he could not be the worse for it, and he was bound to be better. They served a great purpose in that they afforded an opportunity for that physical training which all desired, and for fifty years they had plodded on, doing their best in a quiet way for the benefit of their country, and, while permitted, they would continue so to do.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said that anybody who had listened to the speech of the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite and other hon. Members who had spoken in the debate, would very much regret that this was the first time for four years that the Volunteer Estimates had been put before the House, and the House had been able to give the Secretary of State any guidance. This was all the more important because the Volunteer force was essentially a civilian force dependent upon civilian officers, maintained by civilian efforts, and put under the control of the Secretary of State as distinct from the Commander-in-Chief in all particulars of its discipline and organisation. The present Secretary for War had told them that the only condition upon which he would grant the Volunteers any improvements in their organisation and their training facilities was dependent first of all upon a reduction in their number. That was a most unfortunate state of things for the Volunteers. He did not wish to labour the point made by previous speakers that the action of the Secretary of State for War and his predecessor towards the Regulars and the Volunteers had been precisely the same. A circular had been issued which was afterwards condemned and then withdrawn, and that process had prevented people entering the Volunteers, and not only had it reduced the number both of men and officers, but it had also reduced the efficiency of the force.

All this trouble had arisen because the Secretary of State for War would not listen to the advice and recommendations of the Commission who had considered this question. He believed that the answer which the Secretary of State must give to those who drew up the Report of that Commission would be the kind of exertion which would have to be exacted from the Volunteers in the future. That Commission had put a definite question which had never been answered. They asked for what purpose did the Volunteers exist. Was it for the defence of this country, and, if so, was this country to be defended solely by their efforts or was it to be defended by the efforts of Volunteers plus a stiffening and strengthening by the Regular Forces? Upon the answer to that question must depend the Vote before the House and the sort of duties the country was going to exact from the Volunteers. To that question the Secretary of State for War, whatever his other shortcomings might be, had given them a frank, consistent, and constant answer. He had told them both by his own words and through the mouths of two or three other gentlemen that the Government looked for home defence against raids to the Volunteers. Lord Esher had stated that it would be an illusion to suppose that the Volunteers could repel an invasion. It was said that an invasion of this country was impossible, and that raids could only be attempted by a force of less than 5,000 men. It was further stated that 250,000 Volunteers were more than sufficient to deal with 5,000 raiders and therefore the Volunteers ought to be cut down. That was the kind of argument which had been addressed to this House.

He agreed that the right hon. Gentleman had been consistent and courageous in the arguments he had put before the House, and he would quote a phrase or two from the statements which he had made. He told them in the debates which took place at the beginning of this session that there were in the Volunteer force a large number of men who ought not to be in it, and that it was the intention of the Army Council to deal with them in such a way that they would not remain in it in the future. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that they wanted better officers, more efficiency and training, longer time in camp, and other things, and he stated that these could only be obtained after a reduction in the numbers of the force had been effected. That was the principle which animated the right hon. Gentleman in his action to-day and in the circular which he had issued. A similar statement had been made in another place by Lord Donoughmore, who had stated that the Volunteers were slightly more numerous than were now required, and that by a reduction in their numbers they proposed to increase their efficiency. He had laboured this point because he anticipated from the right hon. Gentleman a defence which had already been set up that afternoon. He would no doubt reply that he meant nothing but good to the Volunteers, that he had their interest closely at heart and identified himself with all their aspirations, and that they had no more consistent supporter than himself. He thought it was important to pin the right hon. Gentleman down to his previous statements and actions.

He wished to draw attention to the terms of the circular which had been issued. The first three lines of the original circular stated that it was a statement to the effect that the Secretary of State had been told that from various causes many Volunteer units were not in an efficient state to take the field. They attempted to find out where the right hon. Gentleman got that report from, but he noticed that it had now been withdrawn in the second circular, which read—

> "In view of the fact that during the South African War large numbers of Volunteers offered themselves for service in the field and in view of the many expressions of readiness to take a similar step in the event of this country being engaged in a war——"

In the first circular they stated that the Volunteers were unfit to take the field and in the second circular they call attention to their patriotic efforts in the past. That was no doubt owing to the fact that these proceedings had become very unpopular and that the Volunteers were sternly resenting the action which the right hon. Gentleman had taken. He agreed with the seconder of this Amendment when he said that the Volunteers recognised their shortcomings and acknowledged their defects. They did not object to the Secretary for War pointing out these defects, but what they did object to, and what they would not submit to, was the attempt on the part of the Secretary of State for War, under the cloak of obtaining information which it was perfectly legitimate for him to ask for and proper for the War Office to have, to carry out desires which, so far as they operated at all, had injured and not benefited the

Volunteer force. While they did not object to criticism and acknowledged defects, and while they admitted their own shortcomings and wished to have them remedied, the War Office and the Secretary of State must remember that the work of the Volunteers in the past had been a labour of love. Valuable time had been given up by people who could not afford to give it, and money had been given by people who could little spare it, and all they asked was that the opportunity should be given to the Volunteers to improve themselves and make good their shortcomings. Those efforts could only be continued if the Government remembered that the Volunteers provided a reserve defence for this country wholly and strictly upon voluntary lines, and those people who provided that reserve defence, and who were saving the country an enormous sum of money, had to earn their livehood from day to day by their own exertions in civil life. Therefore, it was the duty of the Government to restrict their military demands on these people to the exigencies and the needs of these people, who, they had to remember, had to get their own living.

Personally, he had for some years had the command of a Volunteer regiment, and he wished to put to the right hon. Gentleman what he thought was necessary to improve the Volunteer force. In the first place the Government must redeem the promise made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover in that House five years ago, when he undertook on behalf of the Government to give them a separate department at the War Office. He knew the Secretary of State for War would say that they had got an Inspector-General of Volunteers. But they had not got an independent department at the War Office, and an independent officer who would act without the intervention of other high officials at the War Office. They ha dnot got a staff closely connected with the Volunteer force. It was true that there was a Volunteer staff officer at the War Office who represented 250,000 Volunteers. If the rest of the War Office were run on the same principle the whole of the institution in Pall Mall could be abolished, and a great deal of expense saved to the country. He would ask one other concession. There were different conditions of employment all over the country, but the War Office applied the same cut-and-dry regulations in regard to camp to all forms of Volunteer corps. They could not make the same conditions apply in civil life all over the country. Why had the Metropolitan corps dwindled? It was because they could not go into camp every year, though other corps in other parts of the country could easily go into camp. As to the question of training, the Norfolk Commission admitted, and all Volunteers admitted, that if they had to face a Continental force, whether large or small, they must be better trained, officers and men. If the Volunteers could not afford to go into camp for a longer period than at present, it was no use attempting to make them do so. Let the great mass of the Volunteer force have separate training on isolated field days throughout the year, and let the Government devote a small sum of money to taking the corps from their centres to some rural district where they could receive some military training in the course of an afternoon. If that proceeding were spread over the whole year they would be able to get the whole length of time, which, under present conditions, they could not get in camp. He urged that the Volunteers should get a reasonable amount for musketry.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Both these things have been done this year; £15,000 extra has been voted for the purpose, and we have relaxed the regulations with regard to camp.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that any effort which the right hon. Gentleman made to meet the needs of the Volunteers would be gladly acknowledged. In regard to ammunition he would ask the right hon. Gentleman if he expected the Volunteers to become marksmen unless they were allowed more than ten rounds for practice. He would beg the right hon. Gentleman, if he thought the Volunteers were of any real value, to make a further allowance to them for ammunition. He was not one of those who pressed the Government for further grants. Upon the ordinary grants now made to the Volunteers their expenses could be met and the men could be made efficient.

He knew that because he had proved it in the course of the last four years. There was no need of money, but there was need of encouragement. They did not want a bribe to do their duty. They were ready to do their duty if they could only get the War Office to encourage them. He remembered that the Prime Minister said that the great deterrent of invasion was the Volunteer force. It stood to reason that the larger and more efficient the force the greater the deterrent. He believed that the Secretary of State for War had either himself initiated, or permitted others to initiate for him, a policy that militated against efficiency. He would only add that the premium which the country paid to the Volunteers as an insurance against invasion was the least burdensome of all the sums devoted to military purposes.

LORD BINGHAM (Surrey, Chertsey) said this was the first occasion on which he had ventured to intervene in a debate on the subject of the Volunteers. With regard to the question of the circular which had been so much discussed, he was not in complete agreement with many of the opinions which had been expressed in regard to it. Most of the speeches on the Volunteers which he had heard during the time he had been in the House had been made by Volunteers on behalf of Volunteers. He did not think enough regard had been had to another party in the transaction—the British taxpayer. He looked upon this circular as the logical method of fortifying the taxpayer in getting value for the money which was laid out on the Volunteers. He entirely agreed with what had been said on behalf of the individual who came worst off in the whole scheme, namely, the medical officer. While strongly sympathising with him, he would say from his knowledge of Volunteers that he did not think that the majority of them would have any objection to having this examination made. At the same time, he must strongly urge the Secretary of State for War not to use this insidious form of reducing the number of the Volunteer force. He hoped it was not the right hon. Gentleman's intention to do so. He would urge him, if he wished to undertake any grave step of that kind, to do it boldly, and say exactly beforehand what he really meant to do.

He associated himself most cordially with the views expressed that afternoon on the subject of the regulations, and the way in which the Volunteers had been treated during the past four or five years. The Secretary of State for War had said that he had relaxed the camp rules. They were all most grateful to him for that indulgence. He would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that it was not merely the relaxing temporarily of camp regulations that was required. They must have some security that in future those regulations would be taken off entirely. The different corps must be judged on their merits. He himself had the honour of belonging to a London corps, and he knew that it was absolutely impossible, looking to the nature of their occupations, that the members of it could go into camp for a week in summer. The majority were clerks in offices in the City, or clerks in banks. A clerk in a bank had probably a fortnight's leave during the year, and if he was a junior clerk he had to take it in March or April. Therefore, a man of that sort must find it absolutely impossible to go into camp in the first week of August with his Volunteer regiment. He would urge the Secretary of State for War to look at the question of the Volunteers in a broad-minded way. Although there were many regiments with men not physically capable of going through a hard campaign, they were yet perfectly well able to do much work that was required of them, and, in addition to their value in that capacity, there were a great many of them who were most invaluable in other ways by the example they set to young men to come forward and do their duty in defence of their country. The Secretary of State for War had always expressed himself in sympathy with the Volunteers, and they were waiting anxiously for practical proof of that sympathy. They hoped that that afternoon they would hear some more definite announcement as to the circular. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that if he could make it clear that it was not intended as a means of reducing the Volunteer force, he, for one, would see no reason to take exception to it.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight) said he would like to defend the Secretary of State for War from the charge of ambiguity which the noble Lord the Member for Chertsey had attempted to put upon him. The noble Lord said that if there was any intention to reduce the Volunteers it should be done in a straightforward manner. The Secretary of State had stated in the most definite and emphatic manner that in his judgment—and he himself believed it was the opinion of some other members of the Government—the Volunteer force, irrespective of whether they were efficient or inefficient, was too large and ought to be reduced. He believed the vast majority of the Members of that House wholly dissented from that view. Therefore, the charge of ambiguity could not be levelled against the Secretary of State for War.

He wanted to draw attention to the method by which the circular was issued, and the object with which it was issued. The hon. Members who had taken part in the debate that afternoon protested not only against the reduction of the force, which was a broad matter of principle, but also against the perpetual mistakes with reference to the Volunteer force. Reference had been made to the proposal to reduce the numbers, but it had been ascertained that that circular was issued without the knowledge of the Inspector-General of the Volunteer force, and that the first he saw of it was in the newspapers. If such a thing were done in business, the place would not last a week. What had happened in this case? The staff officers had never been consulted upon that Order, the issue of which had created a mighty stir. It would be as well to consult the staff officers before issuing such an Order. After the publication of the Order in 1901 no fewer than five of the Metropolitan Volunteer regiments lost 50 per cent. of their numbers by resignation. The Inspector-General was not consulted before the issue of that circular. They had now got into a difficulty regarding the issue of another circular which was causing the greatest concern. Again, he believed the staff officer of the Volunteers was never consulted about this circular at all. Even if the Order—he was referring to the first Order—had been a wise one, the right hon. Gentleman would admit that it had created a mighty stir and it would have been well to have consulted the staff officer of the Volunteers before such an Order was issued. He thought they were entitled to ask the right hon. Gentleman why it was that these perpetual mistakes occurred? They knew why the Volunteers were discontented; it was because they were never consulted. The Committee would hardly believe it, but a brigadier-general of Volunteers, who was a strong supporter of the right hon. Gentleman and his political Party, complained to him only two or three days ago in conversation that he had not got a copy of this Order although it had been published in the *Standard.* Not only was the opinion of these brigadier-generals not asked about this Order, but they had never seen it until they read it in the Press. He asked the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War how that was.

He wished to draw the attention of the Committee to an entirely fresh aspect of the matter, of which this circular was an indication. It was an indication of the intention of the right hon. Gentleman to reduce the Volunteer force. The noble Lord said there was no ambiguity on this point; but he would direct the noble Lord's attention to a speech made by the right hon. Gentleman in July last, in which he said that it was proposed to reduce the establishment of the Volunteers from 350,000 to 200,000. The right hon. Gentleman afterwards said that he proposed to reduce the number of Volunteers by absorption to 180,000, the present strength being 245,000. The right hon. Gentleman could not be charged with doing a thing which had no method or meaning in it. He frankly said that the Volunteers could not be relied on to face Continental troops, nor could they be relied upon unless they had been through the mill.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that he quoted that phrase from the Report of the Royal Commission.

MAJOR SEELY said if the right hon. Gentleman quoted it he did so with approval. Did the right hon. Gentleman say yet that the Volunteer force could not be relied upon to face a Continental army?

***MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER** said he quoted the opinion of the Royal Commission.

MAJOR SEELY said he wished the right hon. Gentleman to understand that they made no charge against him whatever, but they profoundly disagreed with his policy. The right hon. Gentleman believed that the Volunteers would not be able to repel an invasion, that they were not fit to meet a Contintental army, and, therefore, he proposed to reduce their number and to put in their place a short-service home Army which had gone through the mill.

***MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER** said that the whole point of a short-service enlistment in the Army was to build up a large Reserve in a comparatively short time.

MAJOR SEELY said that that was perfectly true; but the right hon. Gentleman also intended to reduce the Volunteer force by absorption to 180,000 men. The position was perfectly clear, and one of those days it would be demonstrated which school of thought was right. He believed that this policy of reduction of the Volunteer force would be disastrous. The noble Lord said that the policy, at all events, tended towards economy. Probably it would do nothing of the kind. They could not, in a Volunteer force which was unpaid, have reduction and efficiency at the same time. The thing was impossible. Experience had shown that in the case of the Yeomanry—a branch of the service which had been singularly successful of late—they had increased in number from 10,000 to 28,000, and with that growth there was a corresponding increase of efficiency. A Regular soldier was paid in money; the Auxilliary was paid in appreciation. If, therefore, they reduced that appreciation they reduced greatly the inducement to join.

The only possible way to get efficiency in the Volunteer force was for the whole Ministerial Bench to say, "We want to get every man to serve." The utmost it could possibly cost was but a trifling matter in comparison with the huge sums of money the country spent. If anyone said that it was unnecessary, he appealed to the recollection of only four years ago. The Financial Secretary to the War Office had had to command men in the field, against an enemy, who did not know one end of a rifle from another. He himself had been in the same position. These men were not trained to know. If the policy which he advocated had been upheld then, all that would have been changed, and Lord Methuen would never have fallen a prisoner, wounded as he was, into the hands of the enemy. The right hon. Gentleman said that this was an argument for conscription. Not at all; it was an argument in the direction of asking the people to give all they could to the service of the State. That was how the Japanese succeeded. This vote was probably the most important that could be given on military matters, because the House was at the parting of the ways. It might be that the right hon. Gentleman was right in his opinion, and that the reduction in the Volunteer force was also a wise step to take. There were other persons, however, who believed that the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman were fatal to the military efficiency of the country, and by this persistent throttling of the patriotic aspirations of the people, the authorities would, by degrees, unless they were more fortunate than they had been in the past, stifle every patriotic desire on the part of the people.

***MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE** (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough) said he did not desire to deal with the general question of the Government's treatment of the Volunteers, but to particularise as to that portion of the force to which he had the honour to belong, namely, the Volunteer artillery, and more especially the field or light artillery. No portion of the Volunteer force had received less consideration at the hands of this and previous Governments than had the artillery. The branch of which he was speaking comprised five brigade divisions, the 1st Monmouth, the 1st Lanark, the 4th Yorkshire, the 1st Lincoln, and the brigade division to which he had the honour to belong, namely, Kent. The Committee would remember that successive Secretaries of State for War had promised an improvement in the armament of these light batteries. His right hon. friend the Member for Dover, as far back as 1900, said in reply to Questions in the House that it was intended to re-arm the Volunteer artillery with modern guns. But that was not a question he could enter into in detail because it would have to be settled almost battery by battery in accordance with whether the corps was field artillery or position artillery. One of the grievances the field artillery had during the *régime* of the Secretary for India was that they beheld the absurd spectacle of artillery Volunteers in spurs doing infantry foot drill, but he believed that the present War Secretary had now altered that.

What was the present position of the Volunteer artillery of which he was speaking? They were armed with 16-pounder guns which would be absolutely useless in case the force was called on to protect this country against a raid. It might be said that they had their mobilisation orders, and their districts in which they were to operate in case of a raid were distinctly laid down. But what chance could they possibly have of efficiently performing their duties if suddenly called upon? Their guns would be just about as efficacious in case of a raid as the noted revolver loaded with Brummagem fireworks would be against the big gun of the foreigners loaded with brick-bats. He must therefore ask his right hon. friend for some explanation as to what he was going to do so far as the Volunteer artillery was concerned. The right hon. Gentleman had told the House some time ago that he had given the Volunteer artillery 15-pounder guns and shortly afterwards that they were to become different kind of gunners, and that they would be armed with the 4·7 gun. That was very subtle on the right hon. Gentleman's part, for the reason that alteration had been made in the experiments with the 4·7 gun, which had been proved to be the worst-shooting gun of any calibre in the British Army. He hoped his right hon. friend would give the most careful consideration to this question, because there could be no use in having men to protect this country in case of a raid if they had not proper and efficient weapons with which to protect it. And he believed he was right in saying that his right hon. friend did not want to abolish the old field artillery Volunteers in the same way as the others. He urged him, therefore, to see to this matter as soon as possible, and to see that the artillery was properly armed in as short a space of time as possible.

Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore.

SIR A. HAYTER (Walsall) said the views of the Secretary of State for War were very plain, as could be seen from his own words in various speeches made in the House and elsewhere, and also in the Memorandum presented to the House with the Army Estimates. He sympathised very much with the hon. Member for East Edinburgh, who initiated this debate in so able a speech, and who said some information ought to be given as to the circulars. The first of those alluded to "active service in the field" and showed the intention of sending Volunteers abroad; the second introduced the South African War and referred to "active service abroad." In the concluding paragraph of both circulars was to be found indication of an intention to draw a sharp distinction between efficients and non-efficients so as to distinguish between the sheep and the goats and keep them distinct. The commanding officers were asked for information as to Volunteer units inefficient from any cause, and whether such should be disbanded or amalgamated, and also, in making those recommendations, what was proposed as to reduction of adjutants or staff. He rose chiefly to quote exactly the views of the Secretary of State for War. Some doubt had been expressed in regard to them; but he had no doubt whatever. He would not say that the views of the right hon. Gentleman were right; in fact he thought they were wrong; but there was no doubt about what those views were. The right hon. Gentleman on March 21st said, in reply to a Question from the hon. Member for the Isle of Wight—

> "It is proposed to make a reduction in the strength of the Volunteer force."

He was then asked—

"Is it to be a reduction in numbers or in establishment?

and the reply was—

"It is in both; it must take place very gradually."

On March 28th he said—

"We have 360,000 men who are tied to the soil of the country in time of war. I have expressed the view, which I think is logical, consistent, and coherent, that we should consent to a reduction of that force in order to increase its efficiency. I want someone categorically to affirm that the maintenance of 360,000 men tied to the soil by law, is necessary for the defence of the country against any danger reasonably to be apprehended."

On April 3rd he said—

"I am an advocate, and a strong advocate, of the reduction of the establishment of the Volunteers."

Again, in answer to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition he said—

"You eliminate those who, after a medical examination, are found to be unfit. It is the fact that medical examination is the rarest possible event after entry into the Volunteers."

From that it would be seen that there could be no doubt as to the views of the right hon. Gentleman. But if there were any doubt it would be dispelled by the words of the Memorandum issued to the House with the Army Estimates. If anybody entertained a doubt that these circulars were intended to give the right hon. Gentleman a basis upon which he could strike off the men, then he could only reply that the introduction of "foreign service" was intended to give him a lever by which he could do so. The view of those on that side of the House was exactly that expressed by the right hon. Member for Berwick, who on April 3rd said—

"The Volunteers, I think, must be made to feel that their system is a real system of national training, by means of which, if this country is ever attacked in a great war, either at home or abroad, the nation will be able to use all its forces and united energies for the defence of any part of the Empire. What I think the Government ought to do is, without any limit of numbers, to concentrate their attention on physical development and the elementary training of as large numbers of the population as possible as Volunteers."

With that view, expressed on that side of the House, he cordially agreed. He hoped hon. Members would vote for the reduction.

*Major EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) complained of the disproportionate amount of Parliamentary time given to the Volunteers, who would seem to be the only serious branch of the British Army. But there were other branches of the military organisation of this country which were quite as important as the Volunteer force to which more time might well be devoted. There was no lack of suspicion as to anything concerning the Secretary of State for War and the administration of the War Office. It had been said this circular in some mysterious way was an insidious attempt to bring about conscription in this country. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State had over and over again stated in that House in most unmistakable terms that he was opposed to conscription; that at all events was quite plain. Other hon. Gentlemen had said the right hon. Gentleman was not clear in his expression of his views, but the last speaker had to a large extent settled that point by quotations from the right hon. Gentleman's speeches, which were clear beyond dispute. It had been stated with some justice that a portion of the Volunteer force might be utilised as a reserve for the Regular Army, to serve abroad in case of necessity, and when the right hon. Gentleman made an endeavour to find out what proportion of the Volunteer force would be for medical and other reasons fit to take part in service abroad, he had all these violent accusations and suspicions levelled against him. The constant charge against the War Office had been that it was lacking in prevision. Here was his right hon. friend making a perfectly sensible endeavour to find out what the real condition of the Volunteer force was as to service abroad, and immediately all this outcry was raised.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Is it for service abroad?

*Major EVANS GORDON said they would hear from the right hon. Gentleman what his view was, but personally he would be delighted to see such information collected, not only for service abroad, but for service at home. It was a perfectly reasonable and proper inquiry to make. It was information which ought already to exist at the War Office. [OPPOSITION Cheers.] Then what possible objection could there be to calling for that information? A good deal of ridicule had been cast upon the regulations as to the condition of men's teeth, but that was a very large element in the efficiency of men going on service. The attitude adopted by some hon. Members made one despair as to the improvement of the Volunteers in efficiency or as to the War Office getting possession of the information which every other staff required.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: These are Volunteers.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON said of course the Volunteers were exceptional. Nothing that applied to any other service applied to the Volunteers. They were to be treated as a force apart. Those were views with which he had no sympathy whatever, and he did not believe Volunteer officers generally in the least opposed such inquiries as had been made. If the enthusiasm of the Volunteer force rested upon so delicate and sensitive a basis, the sooner the fact was known the better, but he did not believe it to be so. He believed the discussions raised in that House were out of all proportion to the feeling which existed in the Volunteer force itself. He, therefore, hoped his right hon. friend would not be influenced by such criticisms as those of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Sheffield.

As regarded the general policy, the Report of the Royal Commission and other inquiries declared that there were numbers of men in all branches of the service, including the Volunteers, who not only were unfit for military purposes, but were never likely to become fit. In his opinion it was a wise policy to cease spending money upon *matériel* which could never be of any real military val e, and to devote the money thus saved to providing those things which every Volunteer officer knew were urgently required to make the force efficient. As the Secretary of State had over and over again told the House, the Volunteers were in need of many things the provision of which would cost money, and it was difficult to see how hon. Members could reconcile their constant cries for economy with their desire that, without any sacrifice on the part of the Volunteers, this enormous force should be provided with all that was requisite. Moreover, as far as his information went, the so called infamous treatment of the Volunteers by the Secretary of State had not resulted in a reduction of numbers. The last Return showed that, taking the whole force, there was actually an increase.

MR. CHURCHILL (Oldham) pointed out that in an official Memorandum just quoted by the right hon. Baronet on the Front Bench it was clearly stated that the reduction this year would be 15,000.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON said that at any rate in the early part of the year it was distinctly stated that the Volunteers had increased in number. A great deal too much had been made of these circulars. He cordially supported the idea with which those circulars were issued, and trusted the Secretary of State would persist in his policy of finding out as much as he could about the actual condition of the Volunteers. The criticisms which had been made seemed to point to the fact that the Volunteers were afraid of the true facts being brought out. [“No.”] If that were not so, all he could say was that the outcry raised about the circulars was very much out of proportion to the danger that had been put forward.

MR. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury) said the opposition to the policy of the Government with regard to the Volunteers was due only in a very small degree to the circulars. What was complained of was that the circulars were an indication of the policy of the Government, that policy being directed towards the gradual reduction of the Volunteers, and the Opposition were prepared to challenge that policy both in Parliament and in the country. They disagreed with the policy of keeping a large Army for

Imperial defence across the seas, holding the proper policy for this country to be the maintenance of a small and efficient Army for the defence of the Empire over the seas, and the encouragement of the patriotic spirit of the people so that the Volunteers might be relied upon in time of national stress as a great school of arms from which recruits could be drawn for the Army over the seas. The Liberal Party were not alone in this view. In a recent debate in another place Lord Roberts said—

> "We do not want a large standing Army. . . . Behind that standing Army there must be a Reserve large enough to mobilise all the Regular troops, and to expand the Army to and maintain it at such a size as circumstances may require. . . . The Regular troops . . . can only provide a very limited portion of the Reserve, the main body of which must be formed by the Auxiliary Forces and by the manhood of the country generally."

Thus the opinion of so high an authority was diametrically opposed to the policy of the Government, and it was that policy the Opposition challenged.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said that he held strong views, not as a Volunteer, but as a citizen, regarding the condition of the Army and the military system applied to the Army, and he profoundly disagreed with the basis upon which the Secretary of State was acting with regard to the Volunteers. He disagreed with the proposed reduction to a rigid 200,000. Various speakers had expressed the clearest views as to what the right hon. Gentleman meant and did not mean. Personally, remembering previous debates and utterances of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State, he was not so clear regarding certain points. He was not clear whether the Government intended the Volunteers to be used only for purposes of home defence, or whether they were to be used for home defence and also as a reserve behind the Regular Forces which would be expected to serve abroad in time of war. The Secretary of State on a previous occasion said—

> "The Volunteers to be really valuable must organise their training, their transport, and equipment, and arrange for these purposes on the basis of a foreign-going Army. . . . The Volunteers are rooted to the soil. . . . If they are really to go abroad in time of war, would it not be better to arrange in time of peace so that they may fall into their places in time of war?"

He took it, therefore, that under the present policy of the War Office the Volunteers were intended to be an efficient body for the defence of the soil—of which all would approve—and also that they should be a reserve to go abroad in time of war, if they were willing to go. This was where he differed so strongly from his right hon. friend. If we were ever engaged in a great war, 200,000 Volunteers would not be sufficient for our needs. If we were faced with a great force on the frontier of India, the whole of the Regular Army would be thrown upon that frontier, and where would the Reserve be? Not only all the Regulars, but another 200,000 or 250,000 men would be required if ever we had to face a "Mukden" such as the Japanese and the Russians had fought. If we were to face such possibilities of disaster as the Russians had faced, if we were to be pitted against great armies, we must have great armies to pit against them. The Secretary of State very properly placed great stress upon quality. But quality alone was not sufficient. In the present war it had been proved incontestably that it was only when the Japanese were able to throw great numbers of men into the field that they were able to make their victories decisive and follow them up.

The policy of the Government was unsound in that it did not give enough men. It was also unsound in that it appeared as though the Government thought it necessary to encourage the military spirit only in those who were physically fitted to go abroad. Others besides so-called amateurs had expressed themselves very clearly on this point. For instance, Sir J. Ardagh stated before the Royal Commission that he would prefer 300,000 imperfectly trained men to 100,000 well trained. In the vicissitudes of war it was not necessary that all the men, either on the field of battle or on the line of communications, should be of the highest order of intelligence or military efficiency. Thus experts in whom the Government placed confidence disapproved of the whole War Office policy in this respect.

But there was a much higher attitude to take on the question. Did the House believe that the present Government were organising the military forces of the country to the best advantage of the Empire? A series of young nations within the Empire, with military problems of their own, and anxious to bring their military forces to as high a level of efficiency as possible, were watching us, and what could they think of our policy? He believed there was not one of those nations that was not profoundly unhappy, to say the least, when it looked at the confusion, dissatisfaction, and lack of definiteness which affected our Volunteer system, to say nothing of the Regular Army and the Militia. Those young nations, having gained experience from the South African War, were endeavouring to set their own houses in order. In *The Times* of yesterday appeared a telegram of great moment stating that the Canadian Government was proposing to adopt the principle of universal service, to compel every young man before he reached the age of twenty-one to serve three terms in the Militia. Those young countries were, as democracies, far more definite in their military arrangements than we were, and they were anxious that no particle of energy should be diverted from industrial into military channels if it was possible to avoid it.

In this country he believed there was a real sympathy not with militarism, but with such military life as was absolutely necessary for safety; he did not think the Government really trusted this sympathy, but he believed that if the people were called upon for universal service they would readily respond to the call in time of need. The most democratic people in the world responded in this way in time of need, although they were anxious that their manhood should not be tainted by militarism. In Canada and Cape Colony they had had some experience of this kind of service. He thought they might trust the people of this country also to respond to the call if they only gave every man his opportunity, and although the people might not become a highly efficient body, they ought to give every man an opportunity of serving under the colours. As soon as a man donned the King's uniform he acquired something of a national spirit which he had never known before. The average Volunteer had a year's start of any recruit, because it took a year to turn a recruit into a man. The Volunteer started at least with the advantage that he had been trained as a citizen, and as soon as they put him into the uniform he developed a national spirit. As Lord Roberts had said, the fault he found with the present system was that it did not link itself up with the national life. Those were not his exact words, but that was his meaning, and he thought the Committee would agree with him that it would be a good thing if the Government would change their mind concerning this attempt to reduce the possibility of not only not availing themselves of the manhood of the nation but of providing those necessary military services in time of peace for the possible defence of the soil in time of war. He regretted that he was obliged to differ from the view of the right hon. Gentleman representing the Government, because on this matter he believed that the Government was absolutely wrong. What was more, he thought the whole Empire and the country would say they were wrong, if the people were asked. He had stated this before in the House, and he thought the time would come when the action of the Government and the action of the Secretary of State for War would be regretted, because the country, when it was really roused to a sense of its possibilities and to the real danger, would immediately reverse this policy.

*MR. CHURCHILL said the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had given the House various arguments of a far-reaching character dealing with the Volunteer force and its influence upon the defence and character and spirit of the nation. He thought the Committee would be very generally in agreement with the hon. Gentleman in the opinions he had expressed, and he wished to say a word in support of those opinions. They ought to remember that it was not right to judge the Volunteers as they saw them in time of peace. The Prime Minister had shown in the luminous and comprehensive statement which he had made earlier in the session that it was probable that a certain amount of time would always intervene before any serious blow could be struck at this country, and even if that period only amounted to a few weeks or months, the Volunteer force at the end of that period would be in a very different condition to what it was in ordinary times of peace.

The question they had to decide was really a very grave one. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War had defined his position in regard to the Volunteer force with much candour, and the views he held were formed with knowledge and experience and advocated with great conviction. The policy the right hon. Gentleman had put forward was a policy of reduction. Nobody who had listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman from the Front Opposition Bench (Sir A. Hayter) would doubt that the policy of the Secretary for War was a policy of reducing the Volunteers. To the right hon. Gentleman the improvement of the Volunteers was a secondary, and their reduction a primary, object. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the number of Volunteers was greatly in excess of what the general staff required for the mobilisation scheme they had in hand. The right hon. Gentleman had declared in the Memorandum upon the Estimates that he was enforcing a reduction of 15,000 men and that it would not stop there, but would be carried on until they reached an establishment greatly below anything they had known in recent times. They had been asked to assent to the policy on grounds of economy. The Member for Dumbartonshire had compared the cost of the Volunteers with that of the Brigade of Guards, and he showed the extraordinary cheapness of the Volunteers in proportion to the number maintained and the strength developed. The total cost of the Volunteer force in the Estimates was £1,200,000, whilst that of the other forces exceeded £30,000,000. Therefore the result of the economy the right hon. Gentleman proposed must be inconceivably small compared with the great scale of our military budget. Under these circumstances he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman a plain Question. He invited him to turn his mind back to July 14th, 1904. On that date the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I am going to ask the Volunteers to submit to the same scrutiny as I ask the Line to submit to, as I ask the Militia to submit to, and that is a sacrifice in numbers. I ask leave to reduce the establishment of the Volunteers to 200,000 men. I propose, therefore, to fix the establishment of the Volunteers at 200,000 men and to reduce the strength, by absorption in the first instance, to 180,000."

That was a clear declaration of a most important and momentous decision. He wished to know if the right hon. Gentleman adhered to that statement which he made on July 14th, 1904. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would tell the Committee whether that was the policy which he now put forward and which he was endeavouring to carry out. The Committee would realise from the short quotation he had read that the right hon. Gentleman did not approach the question of Army reform solely in respect of the Volunteers. He had a scheme to reduce the Regulars, the Militia, and the Volunteers as well. No less than fourteen battalions of the Line were to be removed in the interests of economy. All those reductions had been abandoned and no attempt had been made to carry them out. One reduction alone remained and that was the Volunteers, and that policy was being carried out in a terribly effective manner. Whether the right hon. Gentleman meant his circular to be a step in the process of reducing the Volunteers or not it was idle to inquire. It had, undoubtedly, spread discouragement and dismay far and wide. Was this policy to go on? Having regard to the fact that the right hon. Gentleman had postponed all those other large schemes, or at any rate many of them, which he laid before the House last year, surely it would be better to postpone the reduction of the Volunteers until such time as he was able to deal with the whole problem of national defence.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It is not an easy task for me to endeavour to reply to so large a number of valuable speeches, the greater portion of which have been speeches of criticism, and speeches which have dealt with the Volunteers only. I should like, if I can, to put this debate on a somewhat different plane and to bring into the discussion some considerations which do not appear to have appealed to hon. Members who have spoken. Something has been said of suspicion attaching to myself and to the War Office. It is not for me to deprecate the opinions which hon. Members may have formed; but I sometimes think it would be better if it were possible for hon. Members to believe that those who are charged with the very onerous duty of endeavouring to administer the War Office are as fair-minded as themselves and as truly desirous of solving the difficult problems involved. Those difficult problems will confront anyone who has this task to deal with. Whoever sits at that table at the War Office has to consider not one but many questions. He has to consider, in the first place, the efficiency of the Army as a whole—I mean the Regular Army, the Militia, and the Volunteers, the whole of our fighting forces; and he has also to consider the question of the financial ability of the country to bear the burdens the military defence of the country throws upon it. It has been the good or bad fortune of this debate that the discussion has necessarily turned exclusively on one very important branch of His Majesty's forces; but it is not possible for me to have in mind only that one branch of His Majesty's service, being responsible, as I am, for all.

I must deprecate the suspicion that has been attached to me. I confess it came to me rather with surprise. I do not know why I should be suspected of bad faith in this matter. The Committee will remember that Mr. Forster, whose name I bear and who was long a distinguished Member of this House, was the founder of one of the first Volunteer corps in this country. I do not know how many of my relatives have been, or are now in the Volunteer force, and I have myself been through the ranks in every mood and sense as a Volunteer at school, at college, and in London as a private and as an officer. I count many of my friends among the Volunteers, and I have been in weekly consultation with Volunteer officers, individually and collectively, during my tenure of office. Therefore I do most emphatically protest against the suggestion that I can possibly bring to the consideration of this question the sinister motives attributed to me, or that I desire by stealth, or by any means I cannot disclose, to carry out the policy I have in view.

I have to consider what is, after all, the first duty of my office. I happen to be Secretary of State for War. I have not the experience that some hon. Members in this House have of what war means, but I have been on the fringe of two wars. I have seen Bazeilles with only three houses left, the rest smoking ruins; I have seen Paris destroyed; I have seen the vast extent of territory devastated by the Turkish arms; I was in the middle of the war in South Africa; and I have seen almost weekly the reports of the operations in the great war in the East. And all this experience tends to convince me that some of the considerations, at any rate, which have been brought forward to-night are not those on which this problem ought to be settled.

The overwhelming consideration is, what will be the fortune of this country if we are involved in a war at home or abroad with troops not capable of conducting that war to a successful issue and without the organisation and preparation they ought to receive to enable them to secure victory? That is my sole motive in dealing with this question.

Let me now explain to the House how I have translated my duty into action in this matter. I should like to ask, first, what the situation is; secondly, what the steps taken are; thirdly, what the complaint made against the Army Council is; and, lastly, what is the justice of that complaint; and I hope I shall make it clear to some of my hon. friends that the motives they attribute to me are not correct, and that the intentions charged against me are entirely alien to my mind. We have before us the lessons of the South African War; and some say we have ill-learned, and others that we have wisely learned, those lessons. We have before us the great war going on in the East; and we have before us the change in the whole immediate outlook of this country which has resulted from the definite adoption of the policy which was described in the recent speech of the Prime Minister. What has been the result? We have been led to realise that to a large extent we must look for our principal dangers outside the United Kingdom. I am not going to argue at this moment as to what is the extent of the danger to which this country is exposed from invasion. We are all agreed that there are dangers, and that those dangers have to be guarded against. We are all, I think, equally agreed that the more frequent, the greater, the pressing danger is the possibility of our being engaged in a foreign war, when we shall be in the position described by the hon. Member for Gravesend, without a sufficient number of men to carry on that war. Are we, or are we not, justified in looking upon our great Auxiliary Army as in any way capable of making a contribution on such an occasion as that? I think we are. I think all the House is of that opinion. I have before me a speech by my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Sheffield, who rather censured me for a crime I do not think I committed. He said that the South African War entirely dispelled any illusions which might have prevailed as to whether or not the Volunteers would be fit for service in the field should the necessity arise. The hon. Member for the Isle of Wight said the Volunteers would be ready in such an emergency to take the same part or a greater part than they had taken in South Africa. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick said that in a national emergency the Volunteers would come forward, in his belief, freely to serve. The right hon. Gentleman also said that he trusted that when we were engaged in another war, the conditions under which that war was waged, the conditions of unreadiness and want of preparation, would never be so discouraging on the part of our Government as they had been. So we have the frank admission that we can and ought to rely upon individual members of the Volunteer force for service abroad in time of emergency, and we have the injunction that we are to make some better preparations for their utilisation than were made in the case of previous campaigns. What have we done? We have acted strictly on that injunction. We are not acting upon it with regard to the Volunteers only. The long experience of this country in war has taught us that you can only make war in the countries in which we have principally fought with men who are specially qualified for that arduous task.

The hon. Member asked me if we had made the same inquiries about the men in the Regular Army. Of course we have. We are constantly making them. I have told the House over and over again that in my belief there is far too large a proportion of men in the Regular Army who are unfit for this purpose and ought not to be put in the Regular Army at all. Have we put our belief to the test? Of course we have. We have raised the physical standard for the Army; we have increased the number of rejections. Within the last three months the rejections of men as physically unfit have increased from 35 to 42 per cent. We have introduced a new course of physical training for the whole of the Regular Army. We have greatly diminished the number of soldiers who were taken as special recruits, and we have introduced long-service enlistment, which must give us a much larger number of mature men in the Regular Army. What happened in the South African War? We had to leave behind thousands and tens of thousands of men, because they were either physically unfit or under age. It is now suggested, and I agree with the suggestion, that we ought to look to the Volunteers to furnish us with a contingent for foreign service. Are we to apply to them a less test? No one would suggest it.

But the Regular Army is not the only branch; the Yeomanry has been consolidated in a way which I think has been to the satisfaction of everybody.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: Reduced.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Exactly, reduced. The Yeomanry has been reduced, and with what result? That the Yeomanry is now reported as being better than ever before in its history. Every single report about the Yeomanry is to the same effect. The officers tell me with one accord—the very officers who protested most strongly—that this is the case, because they can choose for their regiments, because they are not bound to retain in their regiments men whom they do not consider desirable from a physical standpoint. Are we right or not right to endeavour to ascertain beforehand what men we can rely upon? I will refer again to the circular. One part refers to the question of active service abroad. We desire to know how many men in the Volunteer battalions are fit under the ordinary conditions of active service abroad. What are these conditions? Are they reasonable or unreasonable? We have already decided that no man shall go to India with the Regular Army under twenty years of age. Is it unreasonable that we should know that the Volunteer who comes forward to serve us is over nineteen years of age? We ask that in general physique he shall not be below the standard laid down in Appendix 13 of the Volunteer Regulations. We ask that he should have a sound constitution, that he should be free from organic disease, that he should possess a sufficient number of sound teeth for efficient mastication—a very important matter—and lastly, that he should have no defects which are likely to interfere with marching or with active exercise. I agree with the comment made by a Volunteer officer the other day, who said that this circular was perfectly right and ought to have been issued ten years ago.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Who said that?

***Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER**: We are making this inquiry and ought to have this information, and I think we should be open to the accusation of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick if we did not make the inquiry now. It is a perfectly *bona fide* and simple inquiry. It affects no man in the Volunteers. No man who is allowed to go into the Volunteers now, no man who is in the Volunteers, will be excluded on account of this inquiry. It is simply an ordinary military precaution which I think we ought to take.

Another part of the circular asks whether there are any battalions which in their present condition are inefficient from any cause. I was twitted by an hon. Member the other day for not disclosing what were my reasons for believing that there were any such inefficient battalions. I do not think that was a very fair taunt. I think we have had brought to our notice facts that cannot be overlooked; we have had a very important Commission, on which not only the Volunteers were represented, but before which many Volunteer officers were heard. I have sometimes been told in this House that I have said unsympathetic things about the Volunteers. I entirely fail to recognise the justice of that charge. I have never entertained that sentiment. Not one single word have I said about the Volunteers which has not been quoted from Volunteer testimony itself. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that we have a very large number of statements, by commanding officers of Volunteer regiments and officers who are brought into contact with Volunteers, to the effect that the condition of some battalions is not what it ought to be, that there are large numbers of men who ought not to be in the battalions at all. I do not want to weary the House or lay myself open to the charge of saying hard things about the Volunteers. I will not quote the very large number of passages that I might cite unless hon. Members desire it. But their general tendency is uniform—that there are large numbers of battalions in which there are men who ought not to be in them.

A Volunteer officer of one of the best battalions in this country told me the other day that were it not for the pecuniary loss he could dispense with advantage with no less than 400 men in his regiment. What is the meaning of that? It means that the incidence of the capitation grant is now such that the Volunteers are not in the same position as the Yeomanry, that they are compelled in their pecuniary interest to take men who are not men whom they would select on physical or military grounds, but who have been taken simply for financial purposes to keep up the finances of the corps. I do not blame the officers concerned, but I have had that testimony from officer after officer. There are hundreds of officers who, if they were made secure, as I think they may be made secure and ought to be made secure, against pecuniary loss, would welcome this opportunity of dispensing with these men on whom they cannot rely, even though it meant some small reduction of the total of their regiments.

COLONEL DENNY: Who are the men you refer to?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: We are asking now that we shall have a report from the regiments themselves as to whether there are any men who come within the terms of the Report of the Volunteer Commission and who ought to be out of the regiments.

Now I want to meet, if I can, this charge which has been brought against me, that it is my desire to reduce the Volunteer forces. Let me give a perfectly frank answer. I have to deal with the whole of the Army, with the finance of the Army; and I am quite confident that if the House of Commons is going to insist, as it has insisted over and over again, not only upon there being no increase in the Army Estimates, but upon a reduction of the Army Estimates, then the only way in which you can give the Volunteer force that which, I believe, they ought to have, that which the Commission reports they should have, that which the Army Council desires they shall have, is by a reduction of those men who ought not to be in the force. I will admit that, if the House likes to increase the Army Estimates by £300,000 or £400,000, they can go a great way towards keeping up the whole of the present Volunteer establishment without a great sacrifice of efficiency. It will not do, however, merely to add £400,000 to the Army Estimates. If you gave me that to-morrow for the purpose, I would not accept the offer. Four hundred thousand pounds, applied under the present capitation grant regulations, would simply increase *pro tanto* the number of men who ought not to be in the force at all. If you change the incidence of the capitation grant, then I admit that a large addition to the Army Estimates would enable you to keep the force at its present strength and at the same time increase its efficiency. But I am not in a position to make additions to the Army Estimates. We are making large reductions. The hon. Member for Oldham asked about reductions in the Regular Army. We have already made a much larger reduction in the Regular Army than we have made in the Volunteers. I am in the recollection of the House when I say that if there was one doctrine more constantly preached to the House than another in regard to the Army it was the necessity for a reduction in the Estimates. My point is this. If I have only to deal with the present amount for the Volunteer force, I cannot give some £300,000 or £400,000 more, which is the minimum sum required, according to my valuation, to provide those things which I think ought to be provided. I believe, therefore, that it is common sense and common reason, as long as I am limited to that amount of money, to apply it in the best way; and if I am right, and my advisers are right, and those Volunteer officers who have given me their counsel are right, there is room, by a judicious adjustment of capitation allowances, to give all that is wanted, and, at the same time, reduce the force. That is the extent to which I have always wanted to go, and I never wanted to go further. I entirely take issue with the hon. Member for Oldham. It has never been my desire to put reduction before efficiency. It is because I could not get efficiency without reduction that I went in for reduction.

MR. CHURCHILL: To 180,000?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I took that figure because, after going line by line through the recommendations of the Norfolk Commission, I calculated the sums which we should require in order to give the benefits which we think the Volunteers ought to have.

*MR. McCRAE: The right hon. Gentleman said that that was only to be the beginning.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No; I think the hon. Member has misunderstood me. I was dealing with the question of reform, whether we should begin with absorption or not.

*Mr. McCRAE: Will the right hon. Gentleman allow me to quote his words?—

> "I propose, therefore, to fix the establishment of the Volunteers at 200,000 men, and to reduce the strength by absorption, in the first instance, to 180,000."

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes; but that has nothing to do with the immediate point. There is no intention whatever of suggesting any lower figure. But I am further very strongly of opinion that, if we have to expend so much money on the Volunteers, it is far better to get rid of those whom, by almost universal admission, we do not require, and to spend the money for the benefit of those who remain. I can assure my hon. friend the Member for Sheffield, who is naturally anxious about this matter, that there is not the slightest intention of reducing the Volunteer force during the recess in any way, except by the application of the ordinary regulations. That has never been the desire of the Army Council or the intention of the circular. The reason why this circular is published now is that if we are to introduce, as I hope we may introduce, these inprovements in the Volunteer force to which I attach so much importance, including the addition to camp allowances, we must know to what numbers we are going to apply them. I am told that I have acted in this matter in a headstrong manner, without counsel, without assistance, and in total contradiction to the views of the Volunteer force itself. Well, I am bound to say that I do not agree with that charge. I do not think the Volunteer force takes that view. I confess I find sometimes an atmosphere among the representatives of the Volunteer force in this House — of whom I desire to speak with the utmost respect—which is not always reproduced at those gatherings of Volunteer officers which I have met in every part of the United Kingdom. I have found among Volunteer officers rather a different spirit. I saw that there was an expression of regret the other day on the part of a Volunteer officer that this circular had been given to the Press. I do not myself object to its contents becoming public property—as far as I am concerned it might be plastered all over St. Paul's—but the officer I refer to thought that it was a disadvantage that documents sent for the purpose of seeking information from commanding officers should immediately be sent to the newspapers, and I confess that I agree and that I appreciate the spirit of that officer. As I say, I think there is a very good soldierly spirit among Volunteer officers as a whole, and I do not plead guilty to this charge, that what I have done or what the Army Council has done has shaken the confidence or impaired the value of Volunteers.

Of course it will be said, as it has been said, that this is driving officers out of the force and diminishing the number of the men. Well, I should like in my own defence to tell hon. Members what the facts are on this question. This disturbing element, which is represented at the present moment by myself, has had this effect ot Volunteer officers. The last year, my first complete year in office, they diminished by fourteen. That is the smallest reduction in the number of Volunteer officers since the war ended. The number of officers now is 1,000 more than it was in 1895. I do not think that a reduction by fourteen is so vast that I ought to be charged with being a disturbing element.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Is the leakage not double what it was in 1898?

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Well, I will give the hon. Member the figures I have here. The number of officers in 1898 was 8,354; the number in 1904 was 8,955. I should like now to say a word about the men. I do not think I have had a much more sinister influence on the men than I have had on the officers. The Volunteers now are 24,000 more than they were in 1899. But my hon. friend the Member for Kilmarnock said truly that good men had gone out of the Volunteer force, and I think he meant that they had gone out on account of the pressure of the camp regulations. That to a certain very limited extent is true. But what has happened is that the camp regulations did not drive men out of the Volunteer force in the sense that less men went into camp last year than before. Last year we had more Volunteers under canvas than we ever had before. The fact is that no less than 175,000 men went under canvas in Volunteer camps. That cannot be taken as an absolute proof of the unpopular and dangerous nature of the regulations. But there has been a relaxation this year, because I believe it is desirable to give some elasticity. The point my hon. friend refers to is this. There must be, especially in the large towns, a certain number of men who are of a class higher than that of the ordinary Volunteers, whose avocations do not permit them to spend a fortnight or even a week in camp. There are four or five battalions in London known popularly as "class corps," which have found these regulations very serious, and there has been a diminution in the corps which was quoted to-day, the Artists corps, and probably in three or four others. That is not common to the London corps, quite the contrary, but it has been the case with some of these regiments; and it is one of the problems connected with the Volunteer force to arrange regulations which shall suit the whole force and at the same time also suit certain battalions working under peculiar conditions. I do not in the least believe that it is right to make the whole of the force after the pattern of these four or five battalions, nor do I think it is judicious to select battalions and label them as "class battalions." I think possibly it may be possible to make some equivalent in musketry or exercise of some kind for those men who, as we all know, would form excellent soldiers in time of war, but who cannot contribute this amount of time in peace. But I believe, as I have said, that what we are aiming at is not objectionable to the Volunteer force as a whole.

I have been told, and, of course, I know it, that the Volunteer force is a great voluntary force whose idiosyncrasies must be remembered and whose peculiar position must be considered. I do not think that I have ever made the mistake of forgetting it; and it would be idle to suppose that you can attempt any great change in the organisation of the force without a great amount of goodwill among those who are its leaders. I believe that we have that goodwill, and shall have it in an increasing measure when a great deal of this misrepresentation has been dispelled. I have before me here one of the Manchester papers, in which there appears a very severe article condemning me and my plans, and I find side by side with this article a report of what is actually happening in Manchester. The article condemns the circular root and branch. It says the usual things about the thoughtless way in which it was issued, and so on; and I find, on the very next page, the statement that—

> "Some of the commanding officers of Volunteers in Manchester have told Mr. Arnold-Forster that they were really anxious to make the force a fighting machine, that redundant material must be sacrificed, and the whole of the citizen army brought up to a uniform standard. The commanding officers of the Manchester corps have already begun to make the order effective. The commanding officer of the 3rd Lancashire Royal Engineers has shown such care in selecting his men that very little fear is entertained of the working of the new order. When in camp at Ilkley, all the men in the battalion were examined by an officer of the Royal Army Medical Corps, and only two were in the least suspected of being under measurement."

I turn again to the paper and I find that the officer commanding the 4th Battalion of the Manchester Regiment—

> "Fully sympathised with Mr. Arnold-Forster in his efforts to raise the Volunteer Force to the standard of fighting efficiency. All commanding officers, he said, are, of course, anxious to have a sound and efficient body of men under their command, and he, with others, intended doing his best to meet the requirements of the Army Council."

In the case of another great town I find an officer commanding a regiment in Middlesex says—

> "It is deplorable that any commanding officer should have the credit of the force and the welfare of the country so little at heart as to tolerate the presence of such men (the physically unfit) in their regiments. Unfortunately the financial pressure and the need for numbers to satisfactorily swell the amount of the capitation grant, must, at times, dim the acuteness of vision of commanding and medical officers."

The commanding officer of another, a country, battalion says—

> "I think the War Office is fully justified in asking for information as to the number of Volunteers who are fit, from the physical point of view, for active service. It is useless, and

> worse than useless—because it gives a false idea of strength—to have men enrolled as Volunteers who would be unequal to the strain of active service."

He continues—

> "It seems to me that the information asked for in the Circular is entirely reasonable Personally, I have no objection to a medical examination of my battalion, and it will take place during the August camp. If there are any men in my battalion unfit for active service, I should like to know it."

I have received communications from all parts of the country showing that the Volunteer officers are not only ready to obey any reasonable order, but that they are as anxious as we are to have this examination in order to make the work of the Army Council in time of war easier than it would otherwise be. I have endeavoured to work with the officers. I only regret that this debate has taken place to-day, because in a few days I am to have a fresh consultation with the Volunteer commanding officers from all parts of the country—a consultation that was arranged long before this Vote was put down. I believe entirely in working these matters in harmony with the Volunteer officers, and I repudiate the idea that this action was taken without reference to them. But what I have said would be quite insufficient to convince hon. Members that they ought not to vote against this reduction if I could not add something constructive to it. The only possible ground on which we can ask the Volunteers to consent to any reduction is to give them something in exchange which they will value and which the country will also value; and this is what I propose. They are proposals that, if carried in o effect, will enormously increase the efficiency of the Volunteers, and will meet definitely the difficulties of the Volunteer officers and men. But they will cost money. We want to change the incidence of the capitation grant. At present, practically every Volunteer, good, bad, or indifferent, is worth 35s.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: A third-class shot is worth only 10s.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The return we have received indicates that the number of third-class shots has been reduced to the exiguous proportion of ·02. If, therefore, my hon. friend will deduct ·02 from my calculation the rest of it will remain. But while every Volunteer is practically worth 35s., there is no reason why a commanding officer should cease recruiting. Every Volunteer officer tells me that a fortnight's camp is not merely twice as good, but three or four times as good as a week's camp; but many Volunteers cannot do a fortnight's camp. We want to give those who can, however, a large inducement to do so. We want to give, not only to the selected "Field Army" battalions, but to all battalions, the opportunity of going, as far as their men are able to do so, into a fortnight's camp. I made one mistake last year, of which I have repented. I thought the large amount of the camp grant we originally proposed would be adequate to recoup what the corps would lose if we took 15s. from the capitation grant for every Volunteer who did not go into camp. I was wrong; for, as I have been told, the camp grant is spent in camp, and the deduction would, therefore, be a net deduction from the sum available for the working expenses of the corps. That is true; and I think it ought to be met by increasing the capitation grant in respect of men who do go into camp. It might be accomplished by giving an extra 1s. a day for those who go into camp for a fortnight, deducting 15s. from the capitation grant for those who do not. The corps would then have the means of replacing by its merits what it would lose by its demerits. I have talked to many officers, and I believe that that arrangement would be very acceptable, though it may require to be modified by the grant being spread over those who go into camp for a week as well as those who go in for a fortnight. But, mark the result. You will, for the first time, put the Volunteer force on the same basis as the Yeomanry. You will give commanding officers the power to choose. The better your men the better your financial position will be.

I have been talking to Volunteer officers lately as to what may best be done. I have found that there is an expense falling on Volunteer officers for camp outside of that which ought to fall on them, as the expense is really incurred in the service of the country. We do not want to pay Volunteer officers, but we do not want them to be out of pocket, and we should like to give them camp special allowances for a fortnight. It has been represented to me that the pay of a subaltern would meet the case. As regards transport, it is perfectly true that we ought to have more transport for the Volunteers; I do not know that there is entire agreement as to how it is to be done. It is a moot point whether we should encourage such experiments as that recently made by an enterprising regiment in the South of England of starting a transport corps, or whether we should encourage battalions to find transport for themselves. I attach enormous importance to schools for non-commissioned officers. The question of men for the Volunteers is nothing to that of the officers and non-commissioned officers. You can train men in a hurry, but you cannot train officers. If I were given the money I would first of all relieve the officers of their out-of-pocket expenses, and would enable the non-commissioned officers to attend schools. A divisional organisation for the Volunteers is to my mind a very important experiment to make, but whether it would be altogether what hon. Members suppose I do not know. Of course, the whole method of utilising the Volunteers at home must be affected by the principles we have adopted, which definitely exclude the maintenance of a great intrenched camp round London, and there must be a redistribution of our forces in accordance with the policy which we now think is the right one to adopt, and whether that will lend itself to a divisional organisation I do not know. But we ought to have some higher organisation for the Volunteer force.

I would say in conclusion that if I have gone against the opinion of any Volunteer officer in advancing the view that more training is necessary, I have erred in good company. Reference has been made to the sacrifices made by Japan in the present campaign. I do not know whether hon. Gentlemen wish to convey the impression that Japan's victories have been won without effort, organisation, or preparation. I am led to believe that those victories are above all due to organisation, training, and preparation, and not principally to accurate shooting or to numbers, though those are important factors. There has, practically, not been a single man in the Japanese armies who has not passed through the regular training under Regular officers. That is an example we need not follow, but it is one we must not forget. I cannot recall more than one single instance in the history of modern warfare where a really untrained force has held its own against a trained army. [" The Boer War."] There could not be found a worse example; for the conditions of that war the Boers were most highly trained. But the only instance I can recall of success gained by untrained troops against a European army is the brief success of Andreas Hofer against the French in 1809.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) referred to the case of the French revolutionary forces under Dumaurrez in 1792.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I admit that that is another case, but that was a very brief and a very peculiar campaign.

I can assure hon. Members that there is no concealment whatever in the circular which has been under discussion. It was prepared originally as a confidential document for the information of commanding officers. I believe that it was comprehended by them. It was published in a newspaper, and it was criticised on the point of form. When I found that it was a document published *urbi et orbi*, to be read by every one, I thought it should be made clear to all who studied it, and I caused it to be redrafted. But I assure the House that there was no ulterior motive in the circular except to ascertain now what is the material to be relied upon in time of war. We are making no new demand on the Volunteers, neither are we throwing any reproach upon them. I have explained as fully as I can what is the state of mind of the Army Council and myself with regard to the Volunteers. I have never spoken of the Volunteers in this House or out of it without expressing my appreciation of their military value, and I do not propose to do anything to diminish their value. I desire the reduction to be limited to that portion of the force not available for the purposes of war, but that is a matter of the future; there will be no serious reduction at the present time. I can only say that if we could be shown a means of carrying out these beneficial reforms without any reduction of the force I, at any rate, would welcome the information. I trust that I have dispelled the feeling apparently entertained that we have done something which was not desired in an endeavour to do what we believe to be in the interest of the Volunteer forces.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) appealed to the Committee to come to a decision on the Vote, because there was not much time to discuss the Secretary of State's Vote.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES (Montgomery Boroughs) asked whether the £300,000 or £400,000 which would be saved by the reduction of the Volunteers would be spent on the remainder of the force. [Cries of "Certainly."] They had to make that perfectly clear. If that were the case the House of Commons would establish the principle that the Volunteers were worthy of greater consideration. He hoped they would have some assurance on that point.

*SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman at the end of his speech mentioned a great many good things that he said could be done and which he desired to see done for the Volunteers; but I understood from him that he had no money to do them with, and that was his position. He has given us purely a Barmecide Budget, and I do not think there is any prospect of it being realised. Therefore, if that is so, it is hardly a satisfactory Answer to the undoubted grievances and suspicions with regard to the Volunteers. A second Question I would ask is this. Do I understand that the right hon. Gentleman repeats the expression that he formerly made as to the reduction of the Volunteers? What he said has already been quoted, but it is very difficult to get an explicit Answer. He said—

> "I propose to fix the establishment of the Volunteers at 200,000, and to reduce the strength, by absorption in the first instance, to 180,000.

That is an implication that the process will go on beyond the 180,000.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No; that is not so.

*SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Then what does it mean?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It means that this will take place in the first instance by absorption. The reason for that limit is that I had to calculate with the funds at my disposal what was the sum necessary to carry out the whole of the proposals which I desired to carry out. That sum represents the capitation grant and expenses and other items for that number of men, namely, 180,000. I have since said that the reduction is to be exceedingly gradual unless a much larger sum is available. It must absolutely depend upon the Army expenditure of this year. The War Office cannot spend the whole of the money in the next year, but they have already made a beginning. The Answer to the Question addressed to me by my hon. friend was that the consideration referred to must depend on the Army expenditure of the year. We have had forced upon us the necessity of a large reduction in the Army expenditure. My hon. friend the Member for the Isle of Wight has proposed that we should cut off forty battalions of the Regular Army.

THE CHAIRMAN: I must remind the right hon. Gentleman that the Leader of the Opposition is in prossession of the House.

*SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Are we to understand that the right hon. Gentleman adheres or does not adhere to the statement—he speaks for himself and seldom speaks of the Government—that it is his intention to reduce the strength of the Volunteers in the first instance to 180,000? If he is not going to reduce them below that number at any time, what is the meaning of those words?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The words seem to me to bear no obscurity. There never has been, and there is not now, any intention of reducing the number of the Volunteers below 180,000.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): Does the right hon. Gentleman adhere to the statement that the reduction is to be to 180,000 men or not?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that they had no further funds available for the Volunteers than were available now, and they could only secure the benefits intended to be conferred by that reduction.

Question put—

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 206; Noes, 232. (Division List No. 280.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Bright, Allen Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N.E.(York,NRWhitby
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(SAndr'ws B'ghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. (Munro Leith)
Findlay, Alexander(LanarkNE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. Morley
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt Hn.John(Montrose)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway,N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph

Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell,
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C R (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Thoedore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas, JA(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Wallace, Robert
Walton, JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W. R.
Woodhouse, Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. McCrae and Major Seely.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt, C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt HnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barry, SirFrancisT.(Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Chamberlain, RtHn.JA.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.SirJoseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt.Hon.Sir JohnE.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants. W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Rt. Hn. Ailwyn Edw.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, R. Hn Sir RB(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS. (Warwick,S.W.
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Green, WalfordD.(Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, SirJames (Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Lewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col, Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,Rt.Hn.SirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hon.SirFrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Morgan, DavidJ (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt.Hon.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marleybone, W,
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, Rt Hn JParker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Turnour, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G E (Notts.
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Viscount Valentia.

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening,

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY [14TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1905-6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £545,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the War Office and Army Accounts Department, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906."

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am very glad that the discussion on the Volunteer question which we have already had has terminated in time to allow me to say a word upon a subject which has even a greater importance than the subject of the Volunteers; and that subject is the administration of the Army as a whole, of which the Volunteer force, important as it is, is only a part. I have been long anxious for the opportunity of laying before the House of Commons after a year and a half of very onerous work some account of what the Army Council has been able to accomplish during that time. I may say we have had a long and difficult task; and I should like to make it clear that every task that the Army Council or Secretary of State undertakes is made, I think, more difficult than it need essentially be by the fact that in relation to the great service over which we are called upon to preside the task is not to the same extent assisted, as is the administration of the sister service, by the stimulating influence of that popular interest which goes so far to make the work of a Minister and a Department effective. I have been associated with both Departments, and I should be loth to say that the one is more or less important than the other; but I am quite certain, having had the almost unique experience of having served in both, that the greatest boon that can be bestowed in the service of a great Department is a sane and reasonable public interest in its administration. I cannot pretend that in all cases the interest that the public or the House of Commons have displayed in the work of the War Office has been altogether sane or reasonable. I think it is not true to say that individual Ministers, whoever they may be, cease to be reasonable beings, cease to be patriotic statesmen when they come to undertake the task set before them at the War Office—my belief is to the contrary; but their difficulties are, I sometimes think, increased by the unreasonably critical attitude of the public and the House of Commons. I think sometimes that a little sympathy, a little consideration of the vast difficulties of those who are charged with administering a voluntary army required for the service of this great Empire, and dealing with problems which have no parallel among the many interesting military problems with which various States have to deal, ought to excite a little more intelligent sympathy than the work of the War Office appears to excite in the minds of those who are its ready, invariable, and inexorable critics. I have been anxious for this opportunity for a long time, because I have made many promises to the House of Commons, and I am anxious to convince the House of Commons and the country that I have not forgotten those promises, and that I have done the best I can, with the assistance of my colleagues on the Army Council, to redeem those promises.

I suppose no Army authority has ever undertaken this arduous task without having to deal with many difficult problems; and I suppose that there have been few Army authorities that have come to that task with greater problems to deal with than those placed before the present Army Council. Not only had they to deal with what I may call the reconstruction of the Army after a long and arduous war had produced the effects it was calculated to produce in the Army, but they had, in obedience to what I think was the general wish of the country, to undertake the difficult task of the remodelling of the constitution of the War Office and also to a large extent of the Army. Here was no easy task, and one beset with many difficulties; and, heavy as those difficulties have been to every member of the Army Council, on none have they fallen more heavily than on the Secretary of State for War.

There was a very scanty attendance in the House, and at this point an hon. Member called the Chairman's attention to the fact that there were not forty Members present.

THE CHAIRMAN said a count could not be moved before ten o'clock.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I think the situation has been made in some respects more difficult by a pronouncement made in another place by a member of the Legislature, a great and distinguished soldier, and I think it is due to the House of Commons and the country that the Secretary of State should be called upon to give an explanation when this Vote is asked for and to say something upon the condition of the Army.

When I first had the honour of addressing the House as Secretary for War I was compelled to tell the House that the condition of recruiting was of a very serious character; and I had also to point out many other deficiencies in the constitution of the Army, some of which I believed, and still believe, are inherent in the Army system and entail the inevitable consequences of the disorganisation arising from a great war. It is our business to try to repair those ravages and deficiencies, and I want to tell the Committee how far we have advanced in the duty assigned to us. A great difficulty which met us was the condition to which the Army had been reduced by the introduction of the short-service form of recruiting. Now the short-service recruitment when adopted was one well adapted to the needs of the situation. We were suddenly called upon to meet the exceptional demands of a great war and had to adopt the machinery best calculated to produce the men who would enable us to pass through that war. But I think it will be obvious to every man who has studied the problem that the machinery was not adapted to the permanent needs of the Empire and cannot be accepted as a solution of the problem. I want to point out what would have been the position had short service continued. I am myself familiar with the figures; they have been my daily study for years past. The result would have been this. I used a strong expression in regard to the infantry in a speech I made at Edinburgh, and it was no exaggeration. Short service was adopted on the supposition that 75 per cent. of the infantry would extend their term of service; but that has not been justified by what has actually taken place, and in the result we found ourselves face to face with extensions at the rate in some battalions of an average of 4 to 5 per cent., and, taking the whole of the infantry, of 20 per cent. That, of course was a very serious state of things. I do not know whether the Committee realise how serious was the position, we having to send drafts to the tropics and the Colonies and being unable to find the men unless we resorted to men with only a year or less in the service. Even less efficient than the infantry was the garrison artillery. They have more than half their strength abroad, and it was obvious that unless some 100 per cent. of the men extended their service the drafts could not be furnished. Here was one of the first difficulties the Army Council had to meet. We had to take prompt steps to put an end to a state of things that if continued would have involved the Army in disaster. The temporary measure had ceased to be suitable. Many opinions were expressed to the effect that the measures we ultimately adopted could not possibly succeed; but I ventured to press my view, and we did adopt the system of long-service recruiting for nine years, which, if it succeeded, we calculated would extricate us from this great difficulty. There were many sinister and alarming prophecies in regard to the effect of a project; but I maintained my opinion that it would be a success, and it has been, and the result I will no give to the Committee.

In October last we began recruiting f the infantry for nine years service, an we have already taken some 17,000 infantry recruits, of whom 15,000 have bee for long service, and by doing so we hav apparently removed the danger whic threatened the Army. We have adde 15,000 long-service men to the Arm and we have at the same time taken th necessary and corresponding measure we have been discharging short-servic men from the Army. We have discharged no less than 12,000 from th Army and we have taken in their plac some 15,000 long-service men.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) 12,000 men since October?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, sinc October. They have all passe into the Reserve. I believe that to hav been an entirely profitable operatio The men we have discharged int the Reserve were useless for th purpose of furnishing Indian draft They could only be sent to India for few months, and they involved expens both for their passages and for thei maintenance while in India. Ver alarming statements have been made, fo which there is not a particle of foundatio to the effect that the recruiting for th Army has resulted in a very serious deficiency. But we have still more tha three months of the recruiting year t expire, and I have no reason to doub that, before the end of the recruitin year, we shall have taken at least 18,00 long-service recruits for the infantry alon I should like the Committee to rememb what the real value of this continge of long-service recruits is. The yea 1903-4 were absolutely abnormal yea with regard to recruiting for the infantr For those two years 28,000 in each yea were taken for infantry recruiting, bu the average recruiting for the four yea 1899-1902 was only 23,446. In 1895 was 19,000; in 1896 17,000; and i 1897, 21,000; and I have the sanguin expectation that before the end of th present recruiting year we shall hav taken 18,000 men, or something equivalent to twenty battalions of lon service infantry under long-servic engagements. I have spoken of the infantry only. Let me now speak of the garrison artillery, which is a force with peculiar recruiting conditions. The larger portion of the garrison artillery being abroad, we must rely upon having an extension at any rate of 100 per cent. What has happened? We have already taken from January 1st, the date on which we began the long-service recruiting for the garrison artillery, 554 long-service men, and we have lost a considerable number of short-service men. The upshot of it is this, that the garrison artillery, one of the arms which gave us the most anxiety, has now been placed on a sound footing, and we have no further anxiety with regard to recruits.

I think I ought to add one fact which I think will be of interest to the Committee. We were speaking this afternoon of the question of the medical qualifications of men for the Volunteers. I should like the Committee to understand that, *pari passu* with this introduction of long-service men, there has been a steady improvement in the class of men taken. The rejections for medical unfitness have greatly decreased, and within the last few months alone the percentage of rejection as between June, 1904, and the present date has gone up from 35 per cent. to 41 per cent. That is to me a very gratifying fact. I have for years pleaded for the elimination of the unfit men. It is the most uneconomical method of taking recruits that could possibly be imagined. These men come in. They are accepted, paid for, fed, drilled, and clothed—and they go out, they leave us. The enormous waste for the first two years of a soldier's life has been one of the most unsatisfactory features, to my mind, of the whole of our Army recruiting. The result has been exactly what I anticipated. We have had far fewer rejections, and, what is even more satisfactory, we have had an enormous reduction in the number of desertions. For the first time for many years the desertions have fallen below 1,000 a year, and the rate of desertion has gone down to an extent which it was absolutely impossible to anticipate a few years ago. It may seem that these are very ordinary figures; but for those who have studied as long as I have the recruiting figures of our Army they will be extraordinarily satisfactory, I believe that, until we are able to get over this problem of the waste in the first few years, we shall not have mastered the recruiting problem at all; but I believe that never have we had a more satisfactory state of things than we have at present with regard to rejection for physical unfitness or the amount of desertion from the Army.

Mr. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury) asked whether these desertions were from the long-service recruits.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir, for the whole of the Army. The interruption of the hon. Member enables me to give an actual figure with regard to desertions which, I think, the House will approve and which, I hope, the public will appreciate. Desertions have fallen between 1901–3 from 12·51 to 3·7 in the last twelve months. We have not got over the difficulty, but we are making great progress to getting over it. There will be great difficulty in finding the drafts for India for the next two years. Any recruiting that we can undertake now will not remove the draft difficulty within the next two years. It will ameliorate it, and I am confident that we are now on the road towards the satisfactory solution of this difficulty, which is the great and unique problem of the British Army.

Lord Roberts has declared in round terms that the Army is no better now than it was in 1900. It would be absurd for me to bandy opinions with so distinguished an officer as Lord Roberts as to what, after all, must be a matter of opinion. It may be that in Lord Roberts' estimation the condition of the Army in the year of which he speaks was equal or superior to the condition of the Army at the present time. That is not my opinion. I do not attach any value to my own opinion upon this matter; but I think I can give facts which will satisfy the Committee, and which, I think, will go far to satisfy the public, that the very strong dictum of Lord Roberts requires some modification, some examination. I was not responsible, Lord Roberts was responsible, for the Army in 1903. I have been responsible for the Army since that time. I do not pretend to know whether the Army improved or whether it deteriorated between the date to which he referred and 1903; but of this I am quite certain—that since 1903 there has been a rapid, a great, improvement in the *personnel* and in the organisation of the Army. I ventured to say earlier this evening that I have never been a prophet of smooth things. I know perfectly well that we are very far from the condition which we ultimately ought to reach and which I hope we shall reach; but I think I can say enough to prove that there has been a steady progression in the direction which we all wish to travel. I am going to prove to the Committee that in every branch of the Army we have made and are making progress. The proof does not rest on any assertions of my own which cannot be identified and checked by any member of the Committee who cares to examine for himself or consult the authorities.

There is that important branch of the Army, the cavalry. For years I have been a strong advocate of an entire change in the organisation of the cavalry. The cavalry has been linked together three regiments at a time, then two regiments at a time, and all these schemes have involved drafting men from one regiment to another—a measure as obnoxious to the officers and men themselves as it was, in my opinion, deleterious and dangerous to the efficiency of the regiments. We have now, with the full approbation and consent of the cavalry officers who have been consulted on this matter, devised a scheme for the organisation of the cavalry which, I venture to believe, is calculated to prove an enormous improvement to the cavalry. I have the most positive assurances from those officers best qualified to judge, and from the Inspector-General of Cavalry himself, that never was the cavalry in a more promising state than it is at the present time, never were they better horsed, that the efficiency of men and horses and their individual training is satisfactory, and that they are now more ready than they have been for many years past to take part immediately in any campaign in which they may be called upon to act. I have long expressed the opinion that we ought to have a striking force. Circumstances over which I have had no control, or very little control, have interfered with the realisation of that ideal; but already it is reported to me that a cavalry striking force has been formed, that the First Brigade, and the Second Brigade, and the Third Cavalry Brigade are almost all quite ready for service, that provisional skeleton regiments have been abolished, and that all regiments are now on a working establishment. The cavalry has been practically entirely remounted, and, owing to the efforts of the Remount Department, which have been very considerable and most creditable, the remounting of the cavalry leaves very little to be desired. There is a difficulty, no doubt, with regard to finding an adequate number of cavalry officers. It is a very serious difficulty, and a very complex question, but we have taken measures, and are taking measures, to ascertain the views of cavalry officers in regard to it. Difficult as the problem is, involving as it does important considerations which have nothing practically to do with the military efficiency of the regiments, we are not altogether without hope that we see an issue from this difficult situation.

I suppose, if I were to choose the branch of the Army which was most important, I should say the infantry. Next to that is undoubtedly the artillery. Well, Sir, we have made very great progress with the artillery. As I think I have already explained to the Committee, the draft difficulty with a most important branch of the artillery, the garrison artillery, has been practically overcome. That difficulty has not arisen with regard to the Royal Horse Artillery and the Royal Field Artillery, but the difficulty which has forced itself on many Members of this House has been the difficulty inseparable from the inferior armament of the artillery. That difficulty has been got over. As I told the House on a former occasion, on the very day that I got the Report of the Committee authorising me to proceed with the manufacture of the new gun, I gave orders that the gun should be manufactured. I was told in this House and out of it that we were not providing enough money for the manufacture of the guns. I said then, and I have said at every subsequent stage, that I would pledge myself that we would find the money faster than the manufacturers would find the guns, and my prophecy has proved correct. At every stage of the manufacture of these guns I have watched them and checked them, and I have done my best to accelerate their manufacture. If, in every particular as to the day and the hour our anticipations have not been fulfilled, we have still made progress which, I believe, is exceedingly creditable to the manufacturing resources of this country, and we ought to be grateful to the members of this Committee. We have delivered or have under inspection no less than thirty-two of the 13-pounder guns and 169 of the 18-pounder guns. We hope by the end of this year to have no fewer than 182 of the 13-pounder guns and 206 of the 18-pounder guns—that is to say, some 388 guns complete, with limbers, wagons, ammunition, and all their appliances. I wish that progress could have been made at an earlier date; but all I can say is that there has been no failure due to the War Office to supply funds, and for the rapidity of this manufacture I think we may fairly give credit to the ordnance factories and to the firms who have taken part in the manufacture of the guns.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER asked whether the guns were being made for India.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The guns that are being delivered at present have been entirely for India. The guns up to the end of the year include guns both for India and for the United Kingdom. But I make no distinction. We have deliberately elected to send the guns to India because we consider there are contingencies which might make them more important for India than they are here. But I can assure the hon. Member that the manufacture of these guns is going on in a satisfactory way, and I believe that every promise I have given—I have given no promise which has not been the result of minute personal inspection and careful inquiry on the spot of those who are responsible for the manufacture of the guns—will be fulfilled.

Sir, there is another important subject. The House, shocked and alarmed, if I may say so, by the deficiency in certain stores in years gone by, has insisted upon the accumulation of a vast amount of military stores for various branches of the service. The Committee known as the Mowatt Committee stated what those reserves ought to be; and I laid down as a very natural and obvious business corollary that I should receive from time to time from the heads of the departments responsible positive signed statements that these stores were in existence on the authority of those who were responsible for their maintenance. Well, Sir, these stores are in existence; they are maintained, and they are available to an extent which, I believe, has never before been the case in the history of the British Army.

The Royal Engineers are a branch of the Army which, I think, is not largely represented in this House; but it is a very important branch. I am not sure that the Royal Engineers, as at present constituted, are entirely appropriate to the important task they have to perform. The Royal Engineer officers are probably the most distinguished in many respects in the Army; they are an important element which the Army cannot afford to lose. But I am sometimes inclined to think that the intelligence and zeal of the Royal Engineers are devoted to subjects which perhaps might be more appropriately dealt with by persons less eminently qualified. We have now an important Committee sitting under the presidency of one of our shrewdest and ablest officers, Sir Evelyn Wood, which is going into the whole question of the organisation of the Royal Engineers. I am most anxious not to lose a single officer of the calibre of the Royal Engineers out of the Army. We want that type of officer. But I have studied this question so long that I think the Committee will pardon me when I say I have come to the conclusion that we are not applying the great talent the Royal Engineers place at our disposal in the most satisfactory manner.

The Army Reserve is in one sense the keystone of our Army organisation. We have heard to-day that a great Reserve is the one thing the country requires in time of war and I agree with that "dictum." During my term of office the Army Reserve has risen from 66,000 to 91,485—the largest figure at which the Reserve has ever stood—and I believe before the end of the year it will probably reach the figure of 100,000 men. I think that is satisfactory. It is not altogether satisfactory, because I believe the Army Reserve ought to be liable to training at certain specified intervals. That is an ambition that may some day be realised.

I believe that there is no force in His Majesty's service from which we obtain better value for money expended than the Imperial Yeomanry. The reports which I have received from the inspecting officers are uniformly favourable. The class of officers in the Yeomanry is probably unique in Europe. We are getting, as we are certain to get in these circumstances, the willing services of capable men. I only hope the Yeomanry may continue to be in the future what they are at the present moment. I should like to say this in justification of my own administration. Both inside and outside this House I was taken to task for reducing the establishment of the Yeomanry regiments; but officer after officer who condemned me at the time I made that reduction has now had the kindness and generosity to acknowledge that that step was the wisest step that could be taken in the interests of the Yeomanry, and to it the Yeomanry owe some measure of their present excellent efficiency.

I have been trying to combat, not in an aggressive way, but quietly and by facts which no one can dispute, the assertion that the Army is retrograding. No one attaches more value than I do to the opinion of such a distinguished officer as Lord Roberts. But when we are asked to accept a sweeping condemnation of the Army as it is, we are entitled to take the opinion also of officers who are actually serving in the Army and are seeing the troops from day to day. I think I may be permitted to quote from the remarks of a very distinguished officer who devotes every hour of his day and all his great ability to the service of his important command. Sir John French, speaking early in this year, said—

> "There were many drags on the military coach. Making full allowance for that, he believed that the Army Council and the Head-quarters Staff had made extraordinary progress along the road which led to efficiency. A few days ago he met Sir Evelyn Wood, a soldier of great experience and distinction, who told him how happy he was in the thought that during his fifty years in the service he never knew the Army so efficient from a training and inspection point of view as on the day he left it. He could fully corroborate what Sir Evelyn Wood had said. He did not believe there ever was a time when the officers and men alike made greater sacrifices or tried to make themselves more efficient as they had done between the time of the late war and the present moment. He did not wish to say they were by any means perfect. But he believed, in spite of great drawbacks, that they were making steady progress, and when next called on to take the field he felt absolutely certain that the British Army would uphold the splendid traditions which it had earned in the past."

I think I am entitled to quote that statement, and I quote it more readily because I so entirely associate myself with the phrase which Sir John French used about the Army being by no means perfect. But I think the views of all these officers and civilians who are working at the War Office testify to the work that is being done, and show that there has been progress, that there is progress, and that we are going forward. That speech was made on March 1st of this year at the Associated Chambers of Commerce. I think that is an earnest of progress. I want the Committee to consider that we are dealing with an Army which went through an ordeal which no Army that I can remember has ever gone through before. We are dealing with a voluntary Army which went through the ordeal of a great and prolonged war. Every other army which has gone through a great war has been able at the end of that war to recuperate itself by the aid of conscription. Our Army has not only had to repair the waste and ravages of war, but also to replace the enthusiasm and the voluntary efforts of those officers and men who, having borne the burden and heat of the day for two or three long years, have given up the service and gone to other fields. That has been no slight task, and I believe we have made a great deal of progress.

The Committee cannot fail to be interested in the fulfilment of the promise I gave as to the financial side of the Army. We have made an entirely new accounts branch of the Army; that has been a most onerous task, and it has been made more onerous because those who were responsible for the financial control of the Army in the War Office have almost without exception been taken away from the office either by ill-health, by the effluxion of their period of service, or by promotion to other offices. The work was left almost entirely to the present Director of Army Finance serving under my hon. friend the Financial Secretary; they have had to recreate the whole financial branch of the Army. It is too early days to prophesy what will be the result of that new departure; but my belief is that we have acted on sound principles, that in carrying out, with some modifications, the recommendations of the Esher Committee we have made it impossible that the difficulties, and to a certain extent the confusion, which beset the financial branch of the Army during the South African War can recur. I speak in the presence of many business men, and I think they will agree with me that we have taken the right course. We are now training in their daily work of life the very men who in time of war will have to carry out the financial work of the Army. What would happen if, by some unhappy chance, we had a war to-morrow? When our new organisation is complete, the officers and the civilians who are carrying on the contract work and the finance work at Aldershot, on the Curragh, and on Salisbury Plain will transfer their activities to the field, and they will have precisely the same work to do in the field which they have been doing at home. The contracts will be made by the same officers who make them at home; the accounts will be rendered by the same officers to the same persons, and over and above all that, the Financial Adviser to the War Office will be at the side of the Commander-in-Chief to aid him in those extraordinary, special, and technical problems which always must beset the Commander-in-Chief, and which certainly did beset the Commander-in-Chief in the South African campaign. It is early days, I say, to speak; but I ask any business man to examine—and I speak in the presence of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who, as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and an old member of the War Office administration, knows a great deal better than I do what are the chances of success of this reorganised branch—still I make bold to say that we are acting on the right principles, and in accordance with ordinary business methods, in the changes which we have made. Everything must depend, of course, on the *personnel;* but we are doing our part, I think, to provide the machinery.

I hope I have said enough to show that the sweeping generalisation that was made in another place was not altogether justified. I believe that we are progressing, that our progress has been uniform, and that it has been directed towards an absolutely certain end. I could not help feeling that that generalisation so condemnatory, so discouraging, was a little animated by the conviction which I know the distinguished soldier to whom I have been referring holds with regard to what is the true remedy for all our Army disorder. I know that he holds, in common with many soldiers who are working with and advising me, that conscription is the only remedy for our military ills. Well, neither Lord Roberts nor I have any commission to impose conscription upon the people of this country; and I think it is not wise, if I may say so, to plan your remedies upon the supposition that this particular method of filling up your Army will be adopted by the people of this country. Whether that be so or not, I am sometimes taken aback by the want of consideration which is given to this question by those who make general statements with regard to it. We have had cases quoted of other countries which have adopted conscription. I have been a student of the military history of other countries, and I say that with one solitary exception there is not a single country in the world which has adopted conscription for the kind of work which our Army is called upon to do. There is an exception—perhaps I may say two exceptions. The French tried conscription for a war in a tropical country, they sent the conscripts in one of their southern army corps to Madagascar, and the horrible mortality which ensued terrified the French nation. That experiment has never been repeated. I have myself stood on the quay at Bremerhaven and seen the German troops returning from an over-sea expedition, and not one of them was a German conscript, they were all voluntary soldiers from the German army. I believe there is no such case in the world, with the single exception of the Japanese army, which, in a climate similar to their own, and on territory a continuation of their own, has a large conscript army abroad.

But I would remind the Committee that our problem is entirely different from that of other nations, and we must consider it on its merits alone. It has sometimes been suggested that conscription is economy. That is a grave error. We have to keep up in India and in the Colonies a regular long-service Army, year in and year out, of some hundred and odd thousand men. We have to provide at home reliefs for that Army, we have to provide the turnover for that Army; that is a constant in our military organisation, and everything you add to that must be in addition. And that constant will remain — whatever you do you will have to provide that Army. And I am confident that the moment you come to put into figures this question of a conscript Army for this country, in addition to this great regular permanent Army which we are obliged to keep on a war footing in time of peace, you will have an addition to the Army Estimates that will startle people who advocate it. But I do not desire to dogmatise about this matter; my own feeling is that conscription on the Continent of Europe is becoming less and not more popular. I believe that the bow is being very tightly drawn. I do not know, and I do not wish to speak about, the view of foreign countries. But I see nothing which makes me believe that conscription is to be the accepted principle in the future. As far as my own office is concerned, I have to deal with another state of things. I have no commission at all to deal with the Army as a conscript Army, still less have I got to deal with the Army as a conscript Army for service in the tropics, and until I receive that commission I am compelled to follow out this problem on lines which depend on voluntary enlistment, and on that only. It is on those lines that I have attempted to deal with the problem.

One word with regard to recruiting. I have never varied by one jot the expression of my opinion as to what is the way out of our difficulties with regard to the recruiting and maintenance of our Army. They say that in the multitude of counsellors there is wisdom; well, I have had a multitude of counsellors, but I am not altogether certain that I have derived an immense amount of wisdom from their counsels, because all these counsels have been contrary as well as contradictory. And I still go back to those principles which I ventured to put before the House a year and a half ago; I find them true now as then, and every successive Administration that has to deal with this problem will find them true too. You will have to find, on a long-service basis, your over-sea Army, and the drafts for it, and the reliefs for it. You will have to find for the reinforcement of that Army in war, a very large Reserve, and that Reserve can only be formed by short-service enlistment.

MAJOR SEELY: No, no!

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Between my hon. friend and myself there is a difference of form, but not of substance; he and I disagree, I believe, and I regret it, as to the exact terms of service in that short-service Army. I think we shall eventually be agreed. But these facts are absolutely certain. The only way you can reinforce your Army in time of war is by the Reservists of a large short-service Army. I have been told that I was wrong in suggesting that we should recruit this Army on a two years basis, or on a one year basis. I have received many recommendations from many men, but I have never seen alternatives to that proposition. I still look forward to a future when the great territorial Army of this country, the Militia, will be the nucleus of this home-service Army. I do not agree with the view that with any increase of service for the Militia recruit less than one year you can possibly achieve those results; and I am certain that the moment you come to put it to the test, and ask Militia officers whether they are willing to undertake service for five or six months in the year and then return to civil life, you will find exactly the same answer as I have got. You will find it is impossible. I do not wish to dwell upon that complex and difficult question; but I do wish to say this, that I have had no reason whatever to abandon any of the opinions I have stated to the House, and I see no other way out of this difficulty than by the recruiting on long service of the men you require for service over-sea in time of peace and recruiting on a short service basis those you require to furnish the Reserve in the time of war. I have already indicated to the Committee that we have got a large contingent of long-service men. We have not got enough, but I hope very soon we shall have enough. I hope in this year we shall have got at any rate enough to warrant us in opening the short-service recruiting. When that time comes we shall make the attempt. We shall try the principle of depots. We shall open a depot which will give the same kind of training as the Guards depot and the 60th Rifles depot. We shall make some small contribution to the formation of a Reserve, and when we have got sufficient short-service men for our purpose we shall revert to the long-service recruiting until we have got enough long-service men to relieve us of the difficulties in regard to the drafts for the troops.

I have spoken, I am afraid, far too long, but if I have made it clear that we have progressed, and are progressing, I have done something. I believe, in spite of the criticisms which are heaped upon the War Office and its representative, that what the Army is suffering from, as was pointed out recently by my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Mid. Essex in one of his pregnant and epigrammatic sentences, is a lack of intelligent public interest and enlightened criticism. I am not sure that all the criticism which is indulged in is really intended to help the Army or those who are responsible for its administration. I see far too little disposition to praise or to help; I see far too great a disposition to find fault. I have now worked for nearly two years in my great office, and I know the character of the men there, and I say that nothing has discouraged me more than, I will not say the criticism, but the indiscriminating criticism to which they are subjected. They are men who have devoted their lives to the service of their country, and a little encouragement and a little trust would help them enormously. But they never receive either help or encouragement, and I cannot help feeling that if for once a trial was made for extending to the administrators of the Army some measure of the goodwill and confidence which are extended to the administrators of the Navy [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh"]—I mean exactly what I say. [MINISTERIAL cheers.] I have heard all sorts of generalisations made in regard to both officers and men, and I say that if some kind consideration was extended to them we should have made far greater progress than we have made under this adverse and, as I think, sometimes unjust criticism. I feel it is only just that I should say so much for my colleagues in the War Office. Still I believe their work during the past year and-a-half has not been unprofitable. I believe there has been progress, and that we are still progressing.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that at the risk of being considered an ignorant critic he wished to express his disagreement with some of the theories which had just been placed before the Committee. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the most bitter and constant criticism of the War Office and its methods came not from the politicians or from the man in the street, but from the officers of the Army in private conversation. It was curious that all the critics who disagreed with the right hon. Gentleman, and whom he described as ignorant, should be men who had a special training and special opportunities for understanding the subject. The right hon. Gentleman said that since he had been in office the Army had greatly improved, and he mentioned the case of recruiting, of which he was so very proud. The right hon. Gentleman talked of how immensely desertions had diminished, but he did not point out that in 1903 men could buy their discharge, whereas in 1901 they could not, and the only way they could get out of the Army was by deserting; and besides, the conditions of service being improved, of course desertions were less in consequence. The important question, however, was what was the right hon. Gentleman going to do with the Army? The right hon. Gentleman talked about long service and short service, and then they were given to understand that the whole of his scheme was not to be carried out. What they wanted to know was how much of that scheme was to be carried out. How much destruction of the present system was going to take place before we had a territorial Army? He pressed most strongly that they should not begin by destroying the Militia and then the Volunteers before the territorial Army was ready. Most hon. Members on that side thought the Militia would be destroyed and the Volunteers injured by the threat which was hanging over their heads like the sword of Damocles. More than that, there was an enormous injury done to the military spirit of the nation. This territorial Army was a shadow which would be like the Army Corps of the late Secretary of State for War, appearing on paper only, an imitation of a foreign army without conscription. These changes had produced nothing but cost, and even the new guns we could not pay for. India had to do that this year.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I do not know why the hon. Member says that. It is entirely incorrect. There is £1,200,000 on the Estimates.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that only a very small proportion of those guns would be supplied to batteries at home, towards the end of the year. Only a small portion of the sum named would be needed for those guns.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER. It will all be spent.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said he was very glad to hear it, but he could not understand that in view of the right hon. Gentleman's statement that the greater number of those guns were going to India. He was dissatisfied with the changes made, which only destroyed one system without giving them another, whilst increasing the cost. He moved a reduction of the right hon. Gentleman's salary by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries and Allowances of the War Office) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

MR. BUCHANAN said he wished to support the Amendment of his hon. friend. He thought it was most unfortunate that there was such a small number of Members present when the right hon. Gentleman made his statement. It was certainly a great mistake that they were not told that the right hon. Gentleman was going to make a statement, practically in reply to what Lord Roberts had said, at the commencement of the evening sitting. The right hon. Gentleman began his speech by quoting Lord Roberts, and he added that Lord Roberts' speech had compelled a reply from him. The Secretary of State for War then proceeded at some considerable length with what he considered was a full and complete reply to the very serious statement made by Lord Roberts in another place. Lord Roberts contrasted the condition of the Army in 1899 with its condition at the present time, and he said that it was no better now than it was in 1899. What was the right hon. Gentleman's reply to that statement. It was twofold, one part was that Lord Roberts at the end of his speech had shown a desire to urge the adoption of conscription for this country. But his Lordship did not stand alone amongst Army reformers in urging the adoption of conscription. The chief of the staff, General Lyttelton, was an open advocate of conscription. They all welcomed the right hon. Gentleman's words when he said that few people really recognised the enormous increase of expenditure that would be entailed by the adoption of conscription, and how wholly unsuitable it would be for the exigencies of our Army in India and other parts of the world.

The right hon. Gentleman had complained a little unfairly of the criticisms which had been made outside this House, but it hardly lay in the mouth of the right hon. Gentleman to complain of criticisms in regard to the Army, because the right hon. Gentleman himself had made his position by vigorous writings and criticisms upon the Army and Navy, and the position he had achieved he owed very largely to those writings and criticisms, which were not always couched in the most gentle terms. Therefore, he did not think the right hon. Gentleman ought to complain of others adopting a somewhat similar line of conduct to that which he himself had adopted with considerable effect in days gone by. The other general line of argument which he took was the old line which children took when they were found fault with: "Please, sir, it wasn't me," and he said that Lord Roberts was responsible.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, I never said anything like that.

MR. BUCHANAN: The right hon. Gentleman certainly took the line that Lord Roberts was responsible from 1899 to 1903, and that he was only responsible from 1903 onwards.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I certainly did not make any such statement.

MR. BUCHANAN said he could not accept the right hon. Gentleman's interpretation of what he had said, because he undoubtedly stated that Lord Roberts was the man responsible from 1899 to 1903, and he drew a great distinction between the responsibility from 1903 onwards. The right hon. Gentleman particularly asserted that it was in 1903 only that he assumed the direction of the War Office and became responsible. He did not think that was the right line for the responsible Minister for War to take in reply to a very serious charge made by Lord Roberts. It would be within the recollection of hon. Members how constantly they had had the right hon. Gentleman telling them that such and such a proposal or scheme was made in the time of the Secretary for India who was responsible and *vice versa*; and for what the Secretary for India was responsible the present Secretary for War always disclaimed any responsibility. He did not think that attitude was quite fair to the House of Commons or to the country. After all, the occupants of the War Office ought to present a solid front so far as their responsibility was concerned to the House of Commons and the country, and one man who succeeded another in such an important office ought to take full responsibility for all the actions and policy of his predecessors. They could not admit that the right hon. Gentleman was entitled in any way to minimise his responsibility as a member of the Government for the conduct of affairs in the War Office during the time the Government had been in power.

The right hon. Gentleman tried to show how very much things had improved since he came into office in 1903. Perhaps he might be permitted to summarise what the statement of the right hon. Gentleman was. First of all in regard to the infantry. The right hon. Gentleman told them that they were short of men in the cavalry and that they were short of officers, but that he was not without hope that this deficiency might be remedied. He further stated that as regarded artillery they were short of guns, but he hoped by the end of the year that this deficiency would be remedied. As for stores he said they had been short, but they had now insisted upon having regular reports as to the condition of the stores. He hoped the War Office would insist upon having those reports regularly delivered, because in another department those reports had not been regularly furnished or demanded by the War Office. Then the right hon. Gentleman went on and spoke of the Royal Engineers, and he said that he was not quite sure that their present condition was entirely appropriate or suitable for the service expected from them. The Imperial Yeomanry was the only branch upon which he would give a clean bill of health and of which he spoke in unqualified terms of praise. He hardly thought that the War Office could take the major share of the credit for the efficient condition of the Imperial Yeomanry, because he remembered that they made merry over that force some time ago, and its efficiency was largely due to the activity of those who directed the force rather than those in authority at the central Department.

To hear a speech such as they had heard from the right hon. Gentleman that night brought upon the ordinary Member of the House of Commons who had no connection with the Army a feeling of despair. He had listened for many years to the debates, and he had taken a certain interest in Army and Navy matters, and the way in which they were connected with the financial interests of the country; and over and over again he had heard with regard to the Army one Secretary of State after another proceed to discuss the fundamental principles upon which the Army rested, but which never appeared to be settled for more than a couple of years. What possible confidence could the country have in the administration of a great and important public Department like the War Office when they were treated to exhibitions such as they had heard in the House that evening? He admired the right hon. Gentleman's ability and persistence in the pursuit of the objects and ideas and schemes which he had at heart, but, after all, what had been the result of his occupancy of the office of War Minister? Two years ago they had the upsetting of the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor. Then came the Esher Committee, and part only of their recommendation was adopted. Then the right hon. Gentleman himself propounded a scheme, but he was obliged to say that he had the authority of the Government only to carry out part of it, and consequently the scheme had never been carried out. Again, the right hon. Gentleman had been obliged to tell them that he was not empowered to do what he admitted was essential for the good condition of the Army. The Secretary for War had told them what he would like to do to improve the Volunteers, but he did not tell them that he was going to do it. He informed them that there was not sufficient money in the Exchequer to carry out those proposals and, therefore, he was in the position of pointing out a more excellent way and saying that the exigencies of the Government prevented him carrying these essential measures into effect. They could not receive such a statement with anything like satisfaction, and disagreements between such authorities as Lord Roberts and the Secretary of State for War were very much to be deplored. The statement the right hon. Gentleman had made was by no means reassuring, and the least the Committee could do that evening was to show its want of confidence in the policy of the War Office and the need for a continuous and settled policy. For these reasons he thought it was incumbent upon the Committee to support the Motion for a reduction.

*COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) apologised to the Committee for venturing to say anything about the Army, but he had been very much struck with the description given by a recent historian, who said that the defeat at Spion Kop was not to be traced to Buller, or Warren, or Thorneycroft, but to Aldershot, and Pall Mall, to the House of Commons and the nation. He was afraid that the House of Commons had to bear a very large share of responsibility in all the difficulties which concerned the administration of the Army. They had heard that evening the case of the Militia put forward. The sad thing that struck him in connection with the discussions in that House was that, while they talked, sometimes rather bitterly and acrimoniously, about the Volunteers or the Militia, or the Regular Forces, they forgot that which was of paramount importance—namely, the constitution of an efficient Imperial service. He thought that every Regular, Yeoman, or Volunteer, should concentrate his mind upon the creation of an Imperial service. To achieve that it was necessary that they should all resign something. They did not find that spirit reflected in the debate they had just listened to. He was very much struck with the canon of military administration which had been laid down by the hon. Member who preceded him, namely, that the Minister of War ought to adopt as his own the policy of his predecessors. What would a Liberal Minister for War say if he were asked to defend the policy of the present Secretary for War. An enormous step would be taken for the safety of the Empire if the War Office could be taken out of the hands of Party administration, and made an Imperial branch of State.

Allowing for all the circumstances, he thought that on the whole the Secretary for War was to be congratulated on a satisfactory statement. As to the Volunteers, it had occurred to him that perhaps the best encouragement would be to give them a more definite and certain part in the scheme of the defence of the country, in connection, he would suggest, with the meeting of raids or anything short of a general invasion. With regard to deserters he would suggest that commanding officers should be empowered to deal with those who had deserted and wished to return to the force. In this way they would get rid of a good deal of the cost of keeping these men in prison and the trouble and expense of holding so many Courts-martial.

He wondered whether hon. Members realised what advances had been made in the conditions of the soldier's life during the last few years. To take only the question of feeding and general comfort: at 7.30 the recruit received besides his ordinary ration for breakfast something allowed by the administration of the depot; at 11 o'clock every man, if he chose to ask for it, could get a bowl of soup for nothing; from 12.30 to 1.30 dinner was served; the men need not go in together, but could take it when they liked between those hours, just as Members might go into their clubs, and they had a choice of four sorts of meat, two puddings, and often something extra which they could take away and eat in their own room; and then at 4.30 came tea, frequently with some little luxury thrown in. All this had been rendered possible by the good management of the large depots, and the curious thing about the system was that it was accompanied by very little drinking; in fact, the canteen was used much less than it used to be. If only hon. Members would spend less time in criticising things they did not like and a little more in understanding things as they were, they would do far more to help recruiting than by the present practice of indiscriminate criticism. It might be said that these were small matters, but they went to make up the popularity of the service, and the fact that the service was more popular and recruits were coming in better was largely due to the common-sense administration of the large depots. The experiment of giving furlough more freely had been tried by some commanding officers with the most excellent results. A common-sense system of administration was gradually being brought into the Army, and the old cast-iron rules were being gradually supplanted. But was not some credit due to those who administered the War Office for the gradual introduction of these reforms? Never within his time as a soldier had so much been done in the direction of progressive reform as had been done within the last few years, and he hoped that Army debates in the future, instead of being made mere Party discussions, would tend more and more to increase the general interest in Army matters, and to the consideration of military questions from a broad national point of view.

*COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) suggested that the hon. Member for Shropshire would make a good recruiting sergeant in view of the glowing pictures he was able to paint of the life of a soldier. There was no doubt a good deal of truth in what the hon. Member had said. Personally, he was not one of those who said that everything connected with the Army was bad. The officers were good; the non-commissioned officers, as compared with those in Continental armies, were distinctly good; and nearly all the men would be good if there was a better system of recruiting. He could not honestly say that the present Secretary of State was worse than other late Secretaries for War, but it must be confessed that the right hon. Gentleman was a little disappointing. Remembering the brochures on various subjects written by the right hon. Gentleman, Members thought when he was appointed that at last reforms would be forthcoming, but he appeared to have allowed himself to be overwhelmed by his circumstances and by the War Office. Doubtless, finance was a most important subject. The late war cost from £100,000,000 to £150,000,000 more than it ought to have done. But there were many difficulties connected with the new system the right hon. Gentleman had outlined. After all, the men would only be practising in these matters, and he doubted whether there would be any really good results. Secret contracts were a great mistake ; they left open the door for great waste, and provided a strong temptation to more objectionable practices. The existence of a similar system for a couple of years would debauch practically any public body. He did not for a moment suggest that the lowest tender should always be accepted, but he did think that the practice adopted by the London County Council and almost every other similar body of publishing the amounts of the tenders was a good one. The present practice of the War Office in this respect provided an opportunity of swindling which in time of war was almost certain to be taken advantage of.

As to recruiting, conscription was impossible for the kind of Army we required, the American system provided good men, but our system was unique. We took a boy at seventeen, made him swear he was eighteen, gave him as much as he was worth at that age, and then kept him on that small pay until he was twenty-four, when he was worth more. If the Secretary of State was a private manufacturer he would probably get a couple of years imprisonment for keeping men against their will, seeing that they made their contracts at the age of seventeen. Possibly that criticism hardly applied under existing circumstances, but it had applied in the past, and it would apply again as soon as the nine years enlistment had been a few years at work. The Government had done a great deal for the private soldier, but he did not think they had done enough to make his pay and allowances equal to the wages he would get in private employment. As to guns, in a few years there would be a demand for guns of a higher velocity, and then in another four or five years the field artillery would have to be re-armed with guns of 2,000 feet velocity.

*COLONEL WELBY (Taunton) said that in January of this year there was issued a scheme for the reorganisation of the home commands from which great things were expected. It was believed to be the outcome of long and careful consideration on the part of the military advisers of the Secretary of State, and was taken as the deliberate pronouncement of the Army Council. It was, therefore, supposed that everything in the way of military needs and possibilities had been considered. Taunton was given as the headquarters of the grouped regimental districts of the Western Command, but in less than three months Exeter was substituted. He immediately communicated with the Army Council and the Secretary of State, and was informed that the main reason for the alteration was that Exeter as a railway centre afforded better facilities than Taunton. It was quite possible to imagine a mistake being made with regard to the accommodation possible in a local town, but to put forward the railway facilities as the reason for the change was a most extraordinary proceeding on the part of the Army Council, as the question of railway communication was one of the first matters that should be considered in connection with preparations for war. If Exeter had been selected in the first place, probably no question whatever would have been raised. It was a small incident, but it excited some doubt as to the foresight and knowledge of military advisers of the Secretary of State. If they made such a mistake with regard to the railway facilities of our own country, how could they be trusted to consider the railways in any other country in which our Army might be called upon to operate ? If more foresight, common sense, and knowledge had been shown the misunderstanding with regard to the two towns might have been avoided.

*MR. CHURCHILL said the hon. Member opposite had referred to a dispute between the two towns of Taunton and Exeter, and the Secretary of State for War on the other hand had plunged into a wide field of military policy, military history, and strategical considerations. The Committee must be recalled to the practical issue involved in the Amendment. The hon. and gallant Member for Shropshire had deprecated Party feeling in the discussion, but if discussion on Army matters during the past three years had proceeded without Party bias and the interposition of the Government Whips there would to-day be a very different disposition of power, not only in the Army, but in all other Departments of State. The reduction had been moved, not because his hon. friend wished to make any personal imputation against the right hon. Gentleman, or because he thought the Secretary of State had been lacking in zeal, industry, or ability in the execution of his great responsibilities, but as a censure, definite, deliberate, and complete, upon the Army administration of the last ten years. These matters had a cumulative effect. The right hon. Gentleman might not be personally responsible for what his predecessors had done, but the Committee of the House of Commons was bound to look at the history of military policy during the whole of the period that it had been in the hands of one particular Party in the State.

Much had happened in the last ten years. During that period the Government had done what they listed, and whatever they had demanded from the public had been conceded. During that period there had been numerous changes in the Army system. Those changes had been so numerous and kaleidoscopic that he would almost challenge any hon. Member of this House to detail them in their regular order without omitting two or three important changes. The Committee would remember the important changes made before the war, under the Lansdowne administration. Other important changes were effected under the stress of the war, and then there was the immense revolution which was to be effected in Army policy by the great scheme of the present Secretary for India in 1901. The Committee would also remember the second scheme under which a revolution was made in the conditions of service in 1902, and this was followed by the publication of the Esher Report. Then followed the declaration by the present Secretary of State for War of his entirely new policy in the autumn of 1903. All these successive changes had taken place during the last ten years, and they had all taken place on the authority and on behalf of those members of the Government who ruled the country from the Front Bench opposite.

But all this had not been done without some cost to the general taxpayer. What could be more impressive than the fact that the Army now cost between £10,000,000 and £11,000,000 more in ordinary peace time than it cost in the year 1898. What ordinary arrangement of language could do justice to such a fact as that? The sum of £10,000,000 or £11,000,000 extra was now being charged to the public, involving as it did increased taxation accompanied with its necessary impediments to commerce and the perpetual diversion of funds urgently needed by the State for other purposes. What greater disaster could the Committee have than that simple arithmetical statement that the Army by which the Empire was defended in time of peace was costing the country between £10,000,000 and £11,000,000 a year more than it cost six or seven years ago. Having regard to the power which had been exercised from the Treasury Bench opposite, and having regard to the schemes which they had put forward and the cost which they had involved; remembering the fact that in order to carry out those schemes it had been necessary three or four times to revolutionise the entire *personnel* of the War Office; having regard to all these facts, which must be considered one at a time as well as in their cumulative bearing, he asked the Committee what had they got for it all. They were, of course, divided by partisan opinions and they could not pretend to speak on these matters with expert authority. Let them, however, go to the heads of the Army and to the great leaders of Military opinion upon whose names the Government had so often been able in the past to place the responsibility. Let them go to the Secretary of State for War, who had himself said that this machine was ill-equipped, not organised for war, and one of the most costly military instruments ever devised. General Sir

Ian Hamilton wrote home to this country that the present condition of the British Army constituted a danger to the very existence of the British Empire. Lord Roberts stated in the House of Lords that the condition of the Army was not more suited to actual war than it was in the year 1899. That was the justification of the Motion which his hon. friend had made. That was the most tangible and effective of all the indictments which had been made against the Government.

What was the condition of the Army at the present time? If they might judge by the evidence of experts, it was in a very bad condition and wholly unsatisfactory. They had abandoned the old system which had existed before the war by which their levies for India were maintained and by which a great Reserve was created which was available when an emergency arose. They had gone back to a system which was previously rejected, namely, a system of long service which, although it might be necessary to meet the exigencies of the moment, nevertheless had failed to provide that very Reserve which the right hon. Gentleman had told them over and over again was vitally necessary for the military purposes of this country either in regard to home defence or in time of war. There was a general feeling of disquiet that extended to every rank in the Army—from the greatest officers down almost to the humblest subaltern in the Line regiments. The artillery of the British Army was, without any single exception, unless it might be the artillery of Servia, the worst in Europe. The right hon. Gentleman had told them what he had done with regard to the provision of guns, and he had pointed out that he had taken money in the Estimates for guns amounting to £1,200,000. It would cost something like £5,000,000 to rearm the artillery, and consequently the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman was less than one third of the sum required. But while he was contributing less than one-third of the sum required for guns the right hon. Gentleman was perfectly ready to take the whole of the credit.

*Mr. ARNOLD - FORSTER: The amount will be £3,500,000.

*Mr. CHURCHILL said that did not affect his argument that only one third of the cost was now defrayed. Even in regard to this niggardly contribution for guns he wished to point out that in the early stages the expense of the principal part of the experiment was to be borne by India. Then there was the story of the short rifle. There was a marvellous scheme by which the rifles of the British Army were to be cut down in order that a rifle of equal length might be used suitable for both cavalry and infantry. He should have thought that a rifle of equal bore was a matter of infinite importance, but nobody in his senses would have troubled about having a rifle of equal length both for cavalry and infantry. The old long rifle might have been inconvenient, but at any rate the cavalry had found a way of carrying this. But this could not be said of the new rifle, which could not be carried by the old method, and no satisfactory method of carrying it had yet been adopted, even by the very troops for whose sake it was invented.

There was the case of the Militia. The tales that reached them of the Militia, principally from the right hon. Gentleman himself, but supported, he was bound to admit, by evidence from every other quarter, were of the most gloomy character. The right hon. Gentleman told them that the Militia was being murdered. Four years ago the Militia was given a bounty of £3 a man, which was to have raised it to 150,000. It had not done so. There were fewer Militiamen to-day than there were before the bounty was given at an extra burden to the taxpayers of something like £300,000 a year. It was the most expensive form of homicide ever known. Then there were the Volunteers. He would not say anything further with regard to the Volunteers than this—that if the right hon. Gentleman ran his eye over the division list to-morrow he would see how very small was the balance of opinion, even in that House of Commons—if, indeed, there was any balance—in favour of the policy of a wholesale reduction of the Volunteers. They had heard a great deal about improving the knowledge and instruction of the officers of the Army, and the first step taken towards this end was to admit a quantity of officers without troubling them to go through the formality of an examination. If there was one principle which had kept our Civil Service and public service free from corruption it was the test of a competitive examination, but that test they had abandoned. There were many real schemes of organic reform whereby economies and efficiency might be effected which had been neglected altogether. Very little progress had been made towards establishing a corps of officers so that they should be easily changeable between their different regiments. A general staff existed in name, but not in fact. The development of a system of double companies in the infantry, and of schemes for the improvement of the Militia and Volunteers, had made no progress.

The Secretary for War had, however, made a momentous announcement—he had declared that he was going forward with the scheme he laid before them a year ago, but which he had not advocated very much during the Parliamentary session. His plan for a double Army was to be carried out, and when they were separated for the winter months they would not know what steps were taken to carry out that great and surprising revolution in our Army system. This scheme was unsupported by any expert military authority. Knowing what he did of Army officers, he could assure the Committee that the right hon. Gentleman in his scheme as detailed to them had not got the support of the Army Council. It might be said, if that were so, Why did not the Council resign? But people did not always resign when they were expected to, and he put no faith in the statement that the scheme had the support of the Army Council because they had not resigned. He earnestly submitted that the progress of the scheme would not only injure the Army, but would block the way to further treatment of the Army problem which might be entered upon at a future date.

It had never been considered incumbent upon a private Member to state any alternative propositions, and he had always observed a praiseworthy prudence in that respect. He asked the indulgence of the Committee to say in four or five sentences what he thought ought to be the policy which the Secretary of State for War should adopt. The policy of the Secretary of State ought to be to stiffen the standards of recruiting, by raising the physical and character tests in every way. That would cause recruiting to fall off, and then those battalions which could not be filled with effective soldiers, probably from fifteen to twenty-five in number, should be disbanded. The right hon. Gentleman should return to the old system of seven years with the colours and five years in the Reserve, which, on the whole, was the best system to meet the varying and often conflicting military requirements of the British Empire. But, whatever was to be done in the future, time was the essence of the solution. There was no magic word that could be spoken which would restore order in the War Office or economy in military administration. Five or six years of thrifty administration were required in order to retrieve the waste of wild experiments, and to repair the ruin of a profligate and fertile incapacity.

*Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said that the hon. Member for Oldham had not only made an attack upon the Government, but he had also told them that if the Party of which he was a Member had been in power they would have done very much better. He would remind the hon. Member that the last time the Party opposite was in office they could not even, in a time of peace, keep a supply of powder, and during their Boer War they got out of the expense by running away. He wished to point out to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War that there were a great many complaints being made amongst Army officers that they were continually being worried for no good purpose. In consequence officers would not stay in the Army, nor was it possible to get officers to go into it. The Army was already very short of officers, and if the conditions were not altered, we should soon be even worse off for officers than at present. In the regiment to which he had the honour to belong, out of about 1,100 rifles there were at least 120 rifles which were practically useless. They might possibly be sent out to war in a month's time, and how were they going to supply the rifles? As far as he had been able to make out, a great number of the other rifles were sighted so as to shoot crookedly. [OPPOSITION laughter.] This might be considered a small detail, but he thought it was most important, and he would suggest that the Secretary for War should appoint somebody to see that these details were put right. No doubt the House would recollect that the same thing occurred during the Boer War. A great number of their rifles had got no foresight protectors, and these were absolutely necessary if the accurate sighting of the rifles was to be preserved. In regard to the mounted infantry, the Secretary for War had adopted altogether a wrong sort of saddle, which was about twice as heavy as it ought to be, and in war time it would continually want stuffing. They had a class of saddle in South Africa which was only about half the weight and half the cost and which never wanted stuffing.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 132; Noes, 169. (Division List No. 281.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Buxton, NE.(York, NRWhitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Cremer, William Randal
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Delany William
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. (Hastings)
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC.(SAndrw'sB'ghs
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Findlay, Alexander(Lanark, NE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. HerbertJohn
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjami
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthe
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, RtHn. C. R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred (Merthyr
Thomas, JA(Glamorgan, Gower)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Ure, Alexander
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.
Woodhouse, SirJT.(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Warner and Mr. Buchanan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, RtHn.Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt, Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt.Hn.GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R, (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes,Rt HnAilwynEdward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay,Rt.Hn,SirRB.(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortsecue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir AugustusFrederick
Gordon, Maj.Evans(T'rHimlets
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, SirJames (Staffords.NW
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hill, Henry Staveley
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W. (Mile End
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn.Walter (Bristol,S
Lowe, Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, SirLewis (Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott(Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Peel,Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff
Reid, James (Greenock
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hn.Chas,Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East
Smith, RtHn.J.Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Turnour, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 14th July, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Wemyss Dock Bill [H.L.]. Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill; Worcestershire County Council (Bridges) Bill. Read 3^{a}, and passed.

Earl of Stamford's Cheshire Estate Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Skegness Water Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Tees Valley Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Whitby Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill. Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill. Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3^{a} on Monday next.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} on Monday next.

Glasgow Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^{a} (according to order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3^{a} on Monday next.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill (No. 139); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill (No. 140). Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3436. Brazil (Pará).

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade. (County of Middlesex Light Railways (Extension of Time) Order, 1905), amending the County of Middlesex Light Railways Order, 1901. (North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways (Light Railway) Order, 1905 authorising the working and maintenance of the Moel Tryfan Undertaking of the North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways Company as a light railway, and other matters.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated 8th July, 1905, declaring Bushire to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, 1876.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (BOROUGH OF DARWEN).

Order made by the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Darwen, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for hairdressers' and barbers' shops within the borough.

COURT OF PROBATE DIVISION (HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE (IRELAND)).

Account of receipts and disbursements, for the year ended 31st December, 1904.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILL.

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the law relating to County Courts in Ireland. Was presented by the Lord Ashbourne; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next. (No. 138.)

THE IRISH LAND ACT.

The Earl of DUNRAVEN rose "To call attention to the *ad interim* Report of the Estates Commissioners under the Irish Land Act, 1903, and to the regulations made by the Lord-Lieutenant and published in the *Dublin Gazette* of 7th July." The noble Earl said: My Lords, since I put down my notice on the Paper to call attention to the *ad interim* Report of the Estates Commissioners, regulations have been issued under the name of the Lord-Lieutenant and published in the *Dublin Gazette*. I do not think the regulations have been laid on the Table of this House, and I do not know why they have not been laid. The Act orders that such regulations should be presented to Parliament at the earliest possible date. The regulations were published in the *Dublin Gazette*, I think, more than a week ago, and I should be glad to know why they have not been circulated amongst your Lordships.

The LORD CHANCELLOR of IRELAND (Lord Ashbourne): They are on the Table.

The Earl of DUNRAVEN: The *ad interim* Report of the Estates Commissioners gives some useful information as to the working of the Act, but on the whole I think it is rather more noticeable for what it does not say than for what it says. It gives us some information, but it leaves us entirely in the dark as to the causes of a certain amount of failure in the Act, and it is impossible to read the Report without coming to the conclusion that it could have contained information which would have been very useful to your Lordships and to Parliament in forming an opinion as to the causes, whatever they may be, that have led to this comparative failure of the Act in certain directions. The Act is entirely satisfactory in one respect. The Commissioners report that practically in all cases owners have retained their houses and demesne lands, and they say that there is no indication whatever that landlords selling their estates have any intention of leaving the country. That is altogether satisfactory, and sets at rest the fears of those who anticipated that the sales of property would be followed by a kind of exodus of the landed gentry —a proceeding which, for financial and many other reasons, would have been injurious to the country.

But in other respects the Act does not seem to be working satisfactorily. As regards the labourers, during the fourteen months which come under review in the *ad interim* Report only fourteen schemes were put forward to the Local Government Board and to district councils. Well, that practically amounts to nothing. I do not wish to comment on that. The Land Act of 1903 was not a labourers Act, but the fact that the clauses in the Act intended to benefit the labourers have been practically inoperative, emphasises the necessity for legislation dealing with that phase of the question, and I should hope it would be forthcoming at a not very distant date. Nor is the Act working satisfactorily as regards the reinstatement of evicted tenants. Up to the end of last year, which is as far as this *ad interim* Report goes, out of 4,275 applications only 137 tenants were reinstated; ninety-one were reinstated by the landlords and forty-six by the Commissioners. Well, my Lords, that is very slow progress. The immense importance of the reinstatement of evicted tenants was urged on Parliament during the debates on the Land Bill, and was fully recognised by Parliament; and it is obvious that for some reason or other the intentions and hopes of Parliament are not in that respect being fulfilled.

I can find nothing whatever in the Report of the Estates Commissioners explaining this very partial success of the Act as regards the reinstatement of evicted tenants. It is plain, I think, from the Report that unwillingness on the part of the landowners has nothing whatever to do with it. It is quite obvious that they do not block the way. I do not know what the cause is. If it is want of money it would be a most lamentable thing that for the sake of a comparatively few thousand pounds the success of the Act in one of its most important principles should be jeopardised. But I cannot help thinking that there must be other reasons which are not disclosed in the Report of the Commissioners, and if His Majesty's Government can give us any information on that point I think it would be very welcome. The Act is also only a partial success in the province of Connaught. In Connaught 3,308 originating applications were made up to the end of last year, as compared with 10,422 in Ulster, 10,057 in Leinster, and 6,846 in Munster. I cannot find in this Report any reasons given by the Estates Commissioners accounting for this comparative failure of the Act in Connaught; and I would remind your Lordships that the immense importance of dealing principally with the uneconomic holdings in Connaught was fully recognised by Parliament.

The intention of Parliament, as indicated over and over again during the passage of the Bill through both Houses, was that the provisions of the Act should have such application in Connaught and the West as to have substantial effect in converting utterly uneconomic holdings into holdings of an economic character; and Parliament believed that the inducements offered to landowners to sell, and the powers granted to the Estates Commissioners, were sufficient to enable them to acquire a sufficient quantity of good and untenanted land in order to improve the condition of the uneconomic holdings which are such a distinct feature of the province of Connaught. I know that the theory has been put forward that this good grazing grass land should be devoted to grazing purposes, and that it is false economy to try and divert it to any other use. But your Lordships will admit that the condition of the people living in these uneconomic holdings is almost intolerable. There are large populations living practically on the verge of chronic starvation in conditions in which human beings ought not to live. If you are to carry out those theories to their logical conclusion, I do not see how you can help admitting that these people ought to be deported from that part of the country and the land allowed to go to waste. But that is not my opinion, nor was it the intention of Parliament. Parliament intended that the effect of the Act should be that the Estates Commissioners would obtain possession of a sufficient quantity of good land to add to these uneconomic holdings, and apparently that has not taken place.

Now, my Lords, what is the cause of this failure in Connaught. I do not find it accounted for in any way in the *ad interim* Report of the Estates Commissioners. They, it is true, mention certain legal and other difficulties, but they are not difficulties of any serious character; they are difficulties that could be easily overcome. Your Lordships know very well that the condition of Connaught is not at all on all fours with that of the other provinces in Ireland. Connaught is full of these uneconomic holdings. I want to know—and I think Parliament and the public have a right to ask for this information—what is the cause of this comparative failure in Connaught. There must be some reason for the small number of originating applications there. These uneconomic holdings are, of course, occupied by men who to a large extent eke out their existence by harvesting in England or by other means. I have seen it stated that the landowners attach a large residential value to these wretched little holdings and are asking an exorbitant number of years purchase in respect of their residential and agricultural value. I am not at all inclined to believe that such is the case.

I have seen it stated, on the other hand, that the tenants are offering prices based on the purely agricultural value of these little holdings. I should be curious to know what view the Estates Commissioners take of the value of these holdings. Do they value them merely on their agricultural value? Do they take into consideration the fact that the occupiers have other means of making a livelihood; or do they consider at all the prospective value that may attach to them when they are improved or enlarged. There is no question at all that the Act is to a very large extent a failure as regards the uneconomic portions of the West, mainly in Connaught. Neither Parliament nor the public have any information whateve before them to enable them to form an opinion as to whether that is due to the parties principally interested in the matter there, to any faults in the administration of the Act, or to any defects in the

Act itself. I admit that to give information would be to give publicity to matters which under ordinary circumstances are and ought to be considered entirely private matters, but the circumstances are peculiar. The great Act of 1903 was not merely an Act to enable one man to sell something to another. It was a great Imperial measure designed for a special purpose, for the benefit, not of individuals or of classes in Ireland, but for the benefit of the whole community in that country. The whole of the tax-paying community pledged their credit to finance the Act. Under these circumstances it appears to me that when it is evident that in a most important particular the Act is failing, Parliament and the people have a right to such information as will enable them to judge of the causes of failure.

My impression is that the Estates Commissioners could perfectly well give such information if they were invited to do so, and it appears to me that that would be the simplest method of dealing with it. But, if no information is given in that or some similar direction, it is perfectly certain that before long, if matters do not go much more smoothly and much more rapidly in Connaught and in the West, an inquiry of some sort by a Committee or Vice-regal Commission will have to be made. The Act of 1903 was a great measure, and it was entrusted in its administration to three very able and capable men as Estates Commissioners. Have these Commissioners had fair play in administering the Act? It seems to me, my Lords, they have not. They are subjected to rules and regulations emanating from two sources—from Dublin Castle and from the Treasury. These unfortunate Commissioners are the servants of two masters; they have to obey the rules coming from these two sources, which may coincide or conflict, or be altered or changed from day to day.

The regulations lately issued under the Lord-Lieutenant's name appear to me, in one or two particulars, to be exceedingly objectionable. The first regulation it is not necessary for me to read at length. The gist of it is contained in the last three lines—

> No vendor or class of vendors shall be given any undue preference over any other vendor or class of vendors.

That seems perfectly right and just, but things are not always exactly what they seem; and I think if your Lordships will consider the matter a little you will find that that regulation will not work out in the way that it is intended to. Roughly speaking, it may be said that there are three distinct classes of estates sold in Ireland—bankrupt estates in the Land Court, estates which are sold to the Estates Commissioners, and estates which are sold by the landlord direct to the tenant. Nearly all of the vast number of originating applications are in the latter category. I should have thought that it was obvious that the proceedings in the Land Court ought to be expedited as much as fairly and legitimately can be done. Mr. Justice Ross has publicly stated that his Court is completely blocked for want of money, and, if only on the ground of economy, the sooner the bankrupt estates are cleared off and the Land Court closed the better. But the Court is already blocked, and it will be impossible for any money, or any sufficient sum of money, to be allocated to the Land Court until this vast accumulation of originating applications for sale direct from landlord to tenant have been disposed of; and at the present rate of progress that will be a matter of probably six or eight years. Is it sensible or wise to allow a deadlock to take place in the Land Court, and offer no means whatever whereby that can be removed?

Then, my Lords, there are sales to the Commissioners. Sales to the Commissioners have scarcely taken place at all. They are very few in number. I do not in the least know why that should be the case, except it be that landowners are afraid that the Estates Commissioners would largely reduce the price which they would otherwise obtain from their tenants. Now, sale to the Commissioners has many advantages. It has advantages to the landlord; it saves him a great deal of responsibility and trouble, and the Commissioners have to pay him 3½ per cent. after the sale is completed pending the distribution of the money. It has most decided advantages, to my mind, to the tenant, and it gives the Commissioners considerable powers of dealing with the cases of evicted tenants and making improvements. That part of the Act has been scarcely used at all. It is quite certain that Parliament was under the belief that that method of sale would be largely resorted to, and evidently wished that it should be largely resorted to. But it has not been, and if this regulation is to remain in force it never can be, because landlords desiring to sell in that way will practically have no opportunity of getting their cases heard until this vast number in the other category have been disposed of.

It is true that the Estates Commissioners are given a certain latitude; they can postpon or accelerate dealing with any particular estate or untenanted land if they see fit. That is a discriminating power which, personally, I dislike. I do not see why the Estates Commissioners should be given power to accelerate or retard proceedings in regard to any particular individual or any particular estate. But, at any rate, that provision cannot affect the main question, and my contention is that the regulation stating that practically the first comer has to be first served will not work out fairly or well, and that whatever money is available should be divided in some way proportionately amongst these three categories of estates. A certain amount should be allocated to the Land Court, a certain amount to the Commissioners for the purchase of estates, and by far the larger amount should be allocated to estates sold direct from landlord to tenant.

The second regulation deals with the question of intimidation. In the first place I am bound to say it seems to me a rather trivial and childish way of dealing with a matter of that importance to say to these men, "Oh! you naughty boys, go to the bottom of the class." I do not think that is the proper way to treat them. But what I object to is that it appears to me to be imposing duties on the Estates Commissioners which they cannot possibly fulfil, and which ought not to be imposed upon them. The Estates Commissioners have to ascertain whether direct or indirect intimidation has been exercised, and if they think it has, then the estates are to go to the bottom of the list. Indirect intimidation is not a very easy thing for anyone to define, and this seems to me a rather improper task to impose upon the Estates Commissioners. Of course, there has been a great deal of pressure used on both sides. A great deal of pressure has been used upon tenants to be true to their class and not to set a bad example by offering too good a price, and a great deal of pressure has been put on the landlords for the same reason, to be true to their class and not set a bad example by accepting a low price. That does not amount to intimidation, but it amounts to considerable pressure.

The pressure of social influence can very often be very severe. But how are the Estates Commissioners to determine whether indirect intimidation has been used or not, and what are they to do if they differ in this matter from the ordinary Courts? There are a number of men to be tried on charges of intimidation by special juries. If the special juries find them guilty and the Estates Commissioners look into the matter and think there has not been intimidation, which is the superior authority, will the estates in question have to be sent to the bottom of the list? It appears to me you are placing the Estates Commissioners in an absolutely absurd position. No doubt a certain amount of intimidation has been exercised. I accept it on the authority of the responsible Minister that a certain amount of terrorism exists which must be dealt with. Stop that by all manner of means, but I do not think that regulations of this kind will have the desired effect.

Consider for a moment what the effect will be on the landlord. The landlord may be perfectly willing to sell his estate, and the bulk of his tenants may be willing to buy; you place it in the power of any scoundrel who happens to write half-a-dozen anonymous letters to have the Commissioners come down and say that intimidation has been used and preclude the landlord from selling his estate for, say, the next ten years. It seems to me pretty hard that the landlord should not be allowed to sell his estate because the Estates Commissioners would be obliged to say that intimidation had taken place. That is not the way to deal with a question of this kind. I have not a word to say against any steps that the Executive think necessary to put down terrorism and to stop intimidation, but this much I will say—that if there was a similar state of things in England, if a great Bill had been passed for the benefit of the English people to put an end to a perennial source of trouble, and if that measure conspicuously failed in an important part and disorder arose, I have not the slightest doubt but that Parliament would back up the Executive in putting down that disorder, but would also insist on getting such information as would enable it to judge whether in the Act itself or in its administration there was any fault which had caused the Act not to work in that direction and to which the disorder might possibly be traced.

I should like some information as to regulation No. 3, because, if I read it aright, appears to me to practically amend the Act. Regulation No. 3 is as follows—

> "Having regard to the provisions of Sections 2, 4, and 8 of the Act, and of the enactments repealed by the Act, untenanted lands when purchased by the Estates Commissioners, whether they form part of an estate sold or have been acquired under the provisions of Section 8, should be utilised for the enlargement of the uneconomic holdings of agricultural or pastoral tenants, or for providing lands for the persons or for the purposes described in Sections 2 and 4 of the Act, and not for the purpose of creating tenancies for the benefit of, or making allotments to, persons other than those described in the said last-mentioned sections.
>
> (*a.*) The Estates Commissioners should only consider the question of providing a holding for a tenant evicted from any holding comprised in an estate upon the sale of that estate, and where there is untenanted land available for such purpose either comprised in an estate or acquired by the Commissioners under Section 8 of the Act.
>
> (*b.*) In considering the said last-mentioned question preference and special consideration should be given to those cases in which the tenancy was lost, not owing to inefficiency or negligence on the part of the former tenant, but in consequence of some general rent dispute."

Sections 2, 4, and 8 of the Act are the sections to which this regulation applies. Section 2 enumerates the persons to whom advances may be made; Section 4 deals with powers of trustees; and Section 8 gives the Estates Commissioners power to acquire land without placing any particular restrictions upon them. That is quite clear from the section. But this regulation does put a restriction upon them. They are obliged to use that land for the specific purposes mentioned here, and they can have no object whatever in purchasing unless they can use it for those specific purposes. They can only use such land for the purpose either of reinstating a tenant evicted from that particular estate, or for the benefit of a tenant on that particular estate, or for the son of a tenant on that particular estate, or to add to a holding not exceeding a rateable value of £5 in the immediate neighbourhood of the estate; and I believe the legal meaning of neighbourhood is almost absolutely touching the estate.

I am not personally well acquainted with that part of the country, but is it not a fact that there are tracts of good grass land from which no tenant has been evicted during the last twenty-five years, which have not been tenanted at all for long periods of time, and in which there are no holdings belonging to the same estate under £5 valuation in the immediate neighbourhood according to the legal interpretation of the term? If that is the case—and I believe it is the case—landlords may be perfectly willing to sell this land and the Estates Commissioners may be most ardently desirous of buying, but they cannot, because if they do they can do nothing with it. They are not allowed to use it in the way the Act intended they should. The regulation restricts them to using the land in a particular manner. The effect of that is to absolutely stop migration. The Estates Commissioners cannot buy these lands and remove people from any distance to them, and therefore cannot make room in the congested portions of the country to enlarge uneconomic holdings; and the practical effect of that regulation will be to make it almost impossible for the Estates Commissioners to carry out the intentions and the wish of Parliament by turning uneconomic holdings in the West of Ireland into holdings of at any rate a tolerably economic character. That regulation, to my mind, is tantamount to repealing clauses in the Act, or, at any rate, to very seriously altering clauses in the Act; and I do protest against the Executive making rules and regulations which can have such a serious effect on the Act as to thoroughly frustrate and stultify the obvious intention of Parliament in passing it.

If this regulation, with the others, continues to be acted upon, the Act will, of course, work, but it will affect mainly, if not solely, the sound and economic properties. It will affect only the healthy part of the body politic. The unhealthy parts—the parts of the country where the disease is acute, where Parliament recognised that the disease was acute and the remedy urgent—will be entirely left out, and Parliament need not be disappointed if the Act does not come up to its expectations. This kind of regulation, interfering with the intention of Parliament to apply a remedy where a remedy is most urgently needed, is certain to cause discontent and possibly disorder. Regulations of this kind are really playing directly into the hands of those who favour disorder and make it more and more difficult for those—and I am sure they are the great majority of the people of all classes in Ireland—whose earnest desire is to see the Act carried out and fulfilled according to the conciliatory spirit which animated the Land Conference which preceded the Act. The Estates Commissioners are forbidden to make grants although they are ordered to do so by the Act. They are told they are to pick out among candidates and aspirants men who are the best farmers and so on, and they are not to make advances to any man who is in such a position that he could get a loan from the Local Government Board. I should have thought that the Estates Commissioners had enough to do as it is, but, in addition, they have to act as a kind of Court to ascertain whether intimidation takes place or not. They have to sit as an examining board in the matter of scientific agriculture, and they have to find out whether a man can or cannot get a loan from the Local Government Board.

I quite admit that at the bottom of all the trouble, and the real cause of the difficulty, is the lack of money. The staff at the disposal of the Estates Commissioners is utterly insufficient. I should like to read to your Lordships an extract from what was said the other day at a special meeting of the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland. Mr. John P. Lynch made a very important speech in which he stated—

> "They (the solicitors) were not allowed to lodge their abstracts of title, although these were sworn and ready, until the *prima facie* titles had been first passed. The *prima facie* titles that were being read in the present week were titles that were lodged on August 7th, 1904."

Further on he said—

> "Originating applications that were lodged last February were only being opened now, and on June 1st there were 10,000 agreements that had not been posted in the ledgers for collection of interest. Why? Because there were ten men doing work that required seventy. At present there were 5,000 applications in which interest due on the 1st of last May had not been sent out. He had in his own office twenty-four originating applications in which the abstracts of title were sworn and ready to be lodged, and the earliest of which was in September 1904, but he was not allowed to put them in. The examiners would not be allowed to read the applications."

Is not that a perfectly scandalous state of things? And all that delay, confusion, and trouble is caused for the lack of perhaps twenty or thirty additional clerks. I believe it would be true economy to facilitate in every way the working of the Act. We have now the Land Judge's Court, the Congested Districts Board, the Land Commission, and the Estates Commissioners all employed upon very much the same work, all engaged in fixing or unfixing rents, selling estates, or proving titles, and until this revolution is completed and the transfer made, all these boards and Courts will go on sitting at enormous expense. My impression is that if the whole transfer could be completed in the next five years the loss which would be sustained on flotation would be more than recouped by the saving of the expense of all these Courts and boards which at the present rate will continue to be working for the next twenty-five, thirty, or forty years.

The lack of money is dangerous. Take this very case of Connaught to which I alluded a little while ago. How on earth can the owners of these grass lands be expected to sell unless they can form some kind of idea when they are to give up possession? They cannot stock them at the risk of having to clear off the stock at any moment. Delay will be very fatal to the working of the Act. In every part of Ireland the basis of nearly every agreement between landlord and tenant lies in the investment that the vendor can make of his purchase money. He founds his agreement upon what he can do with the purchase money when he gets it. He will probably invest a considerable portion of it in paying off incumbrances on which he is paying 4 per cent., 4½ per cent., or 5 per cent., and the balance in trustee securities. That is the foundation of his agreement; ninety-nine out of every hundred of these originating applications are founded on that basis, and if the man cannot get the money what is he to do? He cannot pay off his incumbrances. That was clearly put at the meeting of the Incorporated Law Society which took place in Dublin the other day. Mr. Fry put the position very clearly in these words—

> "Tenants will not consent to purchase unless they can get an immediate benefit by a speedy reduction in their annual payment; vendors with liability on personal covenants, will not run the risk of having their furniture seized at the suit of their creditors, or being pressed on foot of their everyday legal and necessary obligations; and middlemen, paying heavy head-rents, but who desire to sell, will not subject themselves to the chances of having their land ejected pending the sale by reason of the non-payment of their rent. . . . I am not using language too strong when I say that it is intolerable. The public are affected as well as vendors, purchasers, and incumbrancers. The tradespeople cannot get their accounts paid, and commerce in daily life is restricted. All classes of the community are inconvenienced by this present position."

I think that places the case as clearly as it can be placed.

It is perfectly certain that lack of money to finance the Act is causing infinite trouble. Landlords are placed in this position. Either they must decline to sell and are called preposterous persons who ought to be made to sell, or they must go back on the bargains which they have already made, or, worse than all, they have to ask higher terms from their tenants than they would otherwise demand. They must protect themselves against the expense involved in this long and interminable delay, and the result is that all over Ireland landlords are asking considerably higher terms from their tenants than they would otherwise have been willing to accept if they could have relied upon getting their purchase money within reasonable time, and if the whole thing could go through, as it ought to, without these great delays. It was pointed out, in the quotation I have read, that interest is not being collected by the Estates Commissioners. They are letting the tenants get into arrear. How are they going to get those arrears made up? And the interest that is obtained is not handed over to the landlords. They are getting things in that office into such a muddle and mess that it will be almost impossible to extricate them.

I am sorry to have detained your Lordships so long on a very dry subject, but it is a very serious and important subject. It is not, however, for me to attempt to suggest any remedies. I object to the rules and regulations for the reasons I have given, but I admit that the root of all the trouble lies in the lack of sufficient money to reasonably finance the Act. I can imagine that arrangements might be made to relieve the landlords. I should think that with the assistance of the Treasury something in the nature of a certificate promising to pay within reasonable time might be issued; and I should imagine that private effort could produce a trust sufficiently strong to stand between the State and the landlord and the incumbrancers—in fact, that means might be devised for the State either to finance the landlord or assist him to finance himself during the time he has to wait for his money. I do not know whether that is practicable or not. I have heard it stated that there was an idea of offering scrip instead of cash for a portion of the purchase money. Whether that can be of use or not depends on the terms under which the scrip would be issued. I do not see how in the present state of the market it would be possible to avoid making a loss, which must fall on somebody, and if it falls on the landlords I need scarcely tell your Lordships that it will react on the tenants. The more expensive you make it for the landlord the more expensive you make it for the tenant.

Estates to the value of £27,200,000 have been applied for, and estates a little over the value of £7,200,000 have been distributed. That is an absolute deadlock. What is to be done to relieve it? I am not by any means a financial expert, but my own impression is that the system of making frequent small loans is not a good one, and I believe money would be procured more cheaply if we had larger loans at longer intervals. I believe if you went in for sufficient money to carry out the Act for a year or two it could be had more cheaply than a succession of loans of £5,000,000 each year. Of course I am aware that there was an understanding that not more than £5,000,000 a year should be raised during the first three years. That is not in the Act; it was an understanding, but not one of a binding character, and it should be relaxed by mutual agreement. I think it was a mistake in the Act to place the loss on flotation on the Irish Development Grant. This grant was an equivalent grant to be devoted to educational purposes, and I do think it was rather a small-minded matter to place the whole of the loss on flotation on that grant. After all, the Act, although its operations were confined to Ireland, was for the benefit of the whole of the United Kingdom, and the taxpayers of the whole of the United Kingdom pledged their credit for it.

I do not know whether His Majesty's Government have any plan in their heads, or have arrived at any conclusion whether anything practical can be done to relieve the deadlock and allow the Act to work as smoothly as it should. We know that His Majesty's Government have been seriously considering the question, but unfortunately when Government seriously considers a question it does not always follow that they come to any particular solution of it. Of this I am certain, that the Act will not succeed as it ought to succeed, will not fulfil the expectations and hopes of Parliament or of the people of Ireland, unless its operations can be expedited in dealing with the uneconomic problem in Connaught and with the reinstatement of evicted tenants. Of course the Act will go on creaking and groaning in every joint, and the problem will, in course of time, be solved, but it seems to me a lamentable thing, a most pitiable thing, that more than half of the value of a measure so enormously potential for good should be lost simply for the lack of sufficient funds to finance the Act with decent rapidity. I sincerely hope your Lordships, if not to-night, at any rate before this session is concluded, may hear that His Majesty's Government have devised some means for remedying this state of things.

*LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, I do not propose to follow my noble friend through the many points he has brought forward in his able and exhaustive speech, but there are one or two on which I should like to make a few remarks. My noble friend took great exception to the regulations that have been lately issued to the Estates Commissioners, especially to regulation No 2 dealing with properties where intimidation has existed. I was suprised to hear his statement that the Commissioners would have difficulty in knowing whether or not there had been intimidation, and also at his saying that he did not understand what was meant by indirect intimidation. I really thought that the organised system of intimidation which has existed in a great many parts of Ireland was a matter of public notoriety. It is certainly not confined to the province of Connaught. There are certain districts in my noble friend's own county where intimidation has been pretty strongly exercised for some time. He is apparently unaware of the extent of it.

We know that my noble friend's most active mind has led him lately to soar upwards into a higher region of politics; but now that he has, so to speak, come down to earth again and is devoting himself to an inquiry why the Purchase Act is not working as he would desire it, I think he ought to recognise that one reason why it has not worked, especially in Connaught, is this system of intimidation. So far as these instructions to the Estates Commissioners are concerned, they appear to me to be exceeding valuable. I ventured last summer to urge His Majesty's Government to adopt a somewhat analogous course, for I felt that if it could be shown that intimidation did not pay and that the estates in connection with which there had been intimidation would be put at the bottom of the list, the result would be to largely put a stop to intimidation. Intimidation takes various forms, and is so ingeniously contrived that it is not always the case that a criminal prosecution can issue, even where the intimidation has been most efficient. The common course adopted—and this is what I think is meant by indirect intimidation—is that of issuing orders from the United Irish League to every grass farmer in the district to surrender his farm by the 1st of May. That was going on all through last spring, and many of those who refused to comply with the order were held up to public obloquy and boycotted, and people who worked for them were summoned before the court of the United Irish League—for this body, my Lords, holds regular courts—examined, and called upon to defend themselves for the crime of having worked for a man who had incurred the censure of the league.

Your Lordships probably do not know to what extent boycotting can be carried, and what a powerful weapon it is. There is a small property not far from where I live, consisting of a small demesne in the hands of trustees and occupied by a steward with a certain number of small tenants round about. These tenants were anxious, not only to purchase the holdings, but they demanded that this little demesne should be divided among them. The trustees objected to this, and as a result there was a boycott and that was carried to such an extent that nobody would have any intercourse with the steward or those who lived on the demesne; and during an acute fuel famine, although the people living around were given authority by the agent to collect timber on the demesne after the great storm of February last year, which they could have had for nothing, they would not go in. They, therefore, suffered from the boycott which had been instituted on their behalf. I mention this to show how strictly the laws of the United Irish League are observed.

Indirect intimidation takes the form of calling upon the graziers to surrender their lands in the hope that, if thus left derelict, they will be sold by the landlord and divided among the tenants. This, I take it, is what is meant by indirect intimidation as opposed to direct intimidation exercised on the vendor. The fact that the Act has made slow progress in Galway is, I think, to be largely attributed to the intimidation that exists there. A landlord is approached by his tenants, who say they wish to purchase. He says to them, "I am prepared to sell your agricultural tenancies to you, and to divide any untenanted land in my possession among you; but I have other grass farms which are held from year to year and I am not prepared to dispossess those tenants as I think their interests ought also to be considered." Then it not infrequently happens that some land of his which is held under the eleven months system is given up by a tenant owing to threats from the United Irish League. The landlord then says, "I said I was prepared to sell the untenanted land to you, but I did not mean land that had become untenanted owing to illegal pressure, and I refuse to go on with the negotiations." The tenants, on the other hand, when they hear they are not to get the whole of the grazing land, say they will go on as they are. I think that is a reason why the Act is not progressing. The demands of the tenants are exorbitant from their belief that all the grass land in the country is going to be divided among them.

I should like to say a word about the grass land. My noble friend talked about prime grass land which people thought ought to be devoted now to the fattening of stock. Undoubtedly the prime grass land is better adapted for this purpose than for tillage, and it would not be useful to the smaller people if divided among them; it is stiff deep land and they would be unable to till it with their imperfect method of farming. I know an instance, now many years ago, where a landlord divided a good farm of the kind and gave his tenants about twelve or fourteen acres apiece. In about thirty years they were all so absolutely broke that he not only had to let them off several years rent but had to pay their passages to America. He then relet the land to a grass farmer for nothing for a year in order to get it back as far as possible to its original condition, and it is now, as it was before, good bullock land. That is the case with regard to what I may call the prime pasture land in Connaught. But it is no doubt the case that there is a great quantity of second-class pasture land which would be very well adapted for the purpose. My late father divided a farm of that character among small people, and they have done very well on it.

Another difficulty that my noble friend referred to was that of migration, and that is one of the most difficult things that has been attempted. It was tried some years ago by a company started by the late Mr. Parnell, and failed absolutely. First, the people will not move to a distance; they all desire to remain where their fathers and grandfathers were before them; and, if they do move, the people of the neighbourhood into which they go do not receive them by any means with open arms. The Congested Districts Board purchased some time ago in the county of Galway a considerable extent of land, the idea being, it was said, to remove people there from the congested part of county Roscommon; but it was said at the time that if Roscommon farmers were taken into Galway there would be severe fighting, and it has never been done. The Board, I believe, now hold it as a grass farm together with other land, and are indeed stated to be at this moment the largest graziers in Connaught. The questions raised by the noble Earl present great difficulty, but I do not think that any part of the regulations to the Estates Commissioners will have the bad effect which he apprehends, while, taking them as a whole, I believe them to be most useful. I agree with the noble Earl that scrip would not be acceptable to landlords in place of cash.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I am sure everyone in Ireland will be obliged to the noble Earl for having brought this matter forward in such a lucid speech, but there is one thing he omitted to mention, and it is that the Estates Commissioners deserve the greatest credit for having been able to do as much as they have done considering the work entailed upon them and the little material they have had to work with. They have not been able to deal with labourers, with evicted tenants, or with untenanted land. Why? First of all they were put into offices where there was no room for them to do their work; then those offices were enlarged, and now they complain that they have not enough clerks. I ask, my Lords, is that fair? This is one of the greatest measures ever passed for the peace of Ireland, and yet we are hampered in a niggardly and miserable manner for want of proper office accommodation for our Estates Commissioners and lack of assistance in the short staff of clerks.

The Report discloses what they have done and only hints at the real trouble lying at the root of this difficulty, which is the want of money. That this is so is clearly seen from the Report of the congested estates section and the Report on the resales of estates. The operation of the Act has been stopped because the Treasury do not choose to help its working. The noble Earl said it was not for him to suggest a remedy. Neither is it for me, my Lords; but there is one thing I may say at once, that no landlord would accept land stock at the price at which it now stands — namely, ninety-two — in place of cash. One of the great principles of the Act was that the landlords should be paid in cash, and if that offer has not been made, I venture to say the Act would never have passed at all. Coupled with that is also the bonus, which is another inducement. The noble Earl spoke of the interest not being collected by the Estates Commissioners. That, I must say, is a little fault connected with the Estates Commissioners. I will tell your Lordships what happened in my case. I have no reason personally to complain, because my estate has been put to credit, the money invested, and the matter closed. But they did not collect the interest in my case, and I wrote to say that if they did not do so I should have much pleasure in collecting it myself, because the tenants had offered to agree to this. In consequence of that the interest was collected at once, and has been punctually paid.

The noble Earl then went into the question of the Land Purchase regulations. I agree with all he said on that matter, with this exception, that I cannot endorse his observations with regard to the question of intimidation. He knows, as well as I do, that intimidation enters into every aspect of our social life in Ireland, from the highest to the lowest; and I strongly approve of the Estates Commissioners having the power to find out if there has been intimidation. If they are not to find that out, who is to do it? If we are to wait for Judges and juries to find it out the estates would never be sold at all. It is the word that is passed in the market place, and the slight boycotting which stops everything in the details of a bargain, and which may have most evil effect. Therefore, with all due respect to my colleague in the Land Conference, I think in this matter he is wrong, and that the Estates Commissioners should have power to find out the presence of intimidation. I hope the House will understand that at the bottom of all the trouble in connection with the working of the Land Act is the want of sufficient money to carry it out in a proper manner. Moreover, there is not sufficient staff in Dublin to do the work, and the accommodation which is provided for the staff which now exists is most inadequate.

*LORD ORANMORE AND BROWNE: My Lords, I should like to make one or two remarks as to the reason why grass farms have not been sold under the Land Act in Connaught. I do not intend to follow the noble Earl into the question of economic holdings; there is a great deal to be said against enlarging uneconomic holdings. But I think the reasons why landlords do not sell grass lands are two—in the first place, because it is almost impossible to sell them direct to the tenant; in the second place, even if they were prepared to sell to the Commissioners, we must remember that the first thing the Commissioners do is to find out what price the tenants are willing to give, and the tenants generally value the adjacent grass land at the same price as their holdings, forgetting that in the matter of grass lands there is a landlord's interest as well as the tenant's interest to consider. In addition to this the Land Commissioners have to consider the cost of dividing the lands, fencing, and making roads, and consequently the price offered to landlords is very much below the real value of the land as at present let. Landlords cannot obtain a good price for the grass lands, with which they are not desirous of parting, and I think this is the reason why they are not being sold.

My noble friend seemed to think that excessive powers were given to the Estates Commissioners under the new regulations. I confess I would rather put my trust in the excessive powers of the Estates Commissioners than in the excessive powers which we have seen wielded by the local leaders of the United Irish League. A late learned and witty member of your Lordships' House described these gentlemen as the two or three blackguards whom you find in every Irish village and who call themselves the Irish people. I think that was a very true description. I hold that the grazing system has brought great prosperity to the parts of Ireland where it has been adopted, that it is the only industry which has ever suceeded there, and it is one for which the damp climate of the country makes it especially suitable. During last winter when the Government of Ireland had passed gently into the hands of that most distinguished and able Home Ruler the Under-Secretary, terrorism was rampant in many parts of the West. Since our present Chief Secretary has been in power a change has come over the spirit of the dream. The Under-Secretary has no longer the power which he had during the winter, and I am glad to say that we now see a great improvement in the condition of Ireland. Peaceable citizens are able to carry out their daily avocations without fear of consequences, and I think all Unionists and law-abiding Irishmen owe a great debt of gratitude to the Chief Secretary for the attitude he has taken up with regard to intimidation generally and in these regulations, of which I was sorry to hear my noble friend complain.

THE EARL OF ARRAN: I rise to support what has been said by my noble friend Lord Clonbrock regarding the intimidation clauses. I was a little surprised at the noble Earl's view of the present intimidation in Ireland, because I gathered from him that he is only convinced that intimidation does exist because a responsible Minister in Ireland has told him so. I venture to congratulate the noble Earl on living in an Irish paradise of the county of Limerick, wheer the Leaguers cease from troubling and the landlords and graziers are at rest. I am sorry to say that this happy state of affairs does not exist in the South and West of Ireland.

The noble Earl says it is difficult to see how the Estates Commissioners can tell whether or not indirect intimidation exists, or how they are to convince themselves of its real existence. I would point out that there are many cases in which there is no difficulty whatever, and in such cases as that strong steps to prevent further intimidation would be of the greatest use. There is quite close to my own home a large grass farm which has been let for many years on the eleven months system. It was forbidden recently that this farm should be taken by anybody under the eleven months system, and in consequence the owner, a lady, was unable to find a tenant. She was given to understand that the only way in which she could get a value for this farm was by selling it to the Congested Districts Board. Two very courageous people, however, undertook to take the farm on the eleven months system, and resolutions have since been passed on the subject by various local boards of guardians. In one resolution a board of guardians declared that they had heard with very great surprise and regret of the action of certain parties in taking this farm, and thus defeating the object of those who wished to see it purchased by the Congested Districts Board to enlarge the miserably small holdings of the tenants adjoining. That resolution, or a similar resolution, has been passed by several boards of guardians in the locality, and I venture to say that very few people will be found sufficiently courageous to work for those who have taken the farm on the eleven months system, and, that those who have taken it will not be likely, when the eleven months are over, to renew the tenancy.

In such circumstances, I think the powers which have been given to the Estates Commissioners under the new regulations could be easily and justly applied, and I therefore venture to think that the regulations as they stand now are amongst the most useful and necessary regarding intimidation that His Majesty's Government have introduced into Ireland. The knowledge that intimidation is discouraged is of the greatest use, because this is not meant so much as punishment for the offender but as a warning to others, and if people in Ireland know that intimidation will be severely punished they will hesitate before they repeat it. I admit that the intimidation clauses are broadly worded, but in a country like Ireland, where intimidation has been brought to such a fine art, it is absolutely necessary that the regulations should be broadly worded. I sincerely hope that His Majesty's Government will tell us that they intend to proceed with these regulations regarding intimidation entirely unaltered.

*The LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL and PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (The Marquess of Londonderry): My Lords, I feel sure I shall not be contradicted when I say that we have had a debate of a most interesting character, in the course of which we have been afforded an opportunity of hearing from representatives of various parts of Ireland their opinions with regard to the action of His Majesty's Government in initiating those regulations which, after all, have been the main topic of debate this evening. The noble Earl who raised this question never addresses himself, either in your Lordships' House or in the country, to questions connected with Ireland without being listened to with the greatest respect, for he occupies a very prominent position in the South of Ireland and has devoted himself now for many years to watching over the interests and the welfare of that part of the country with which he is so closely connected and in which he is so highly respected. Though there are points on which I differ most essentially from my noble friend, still I yield to none in my admiration of the way in which he has identified himself with movements which have for their object the peace and prosperity of Ireland.

My noble friend rather deviated from the original notice he placed on the Paper, which was to call attention to the *ad interim* Report of the Estates Commissioners under the Irish Land Act, 1903, and has devoted himself to criticism of the regulations that have been recently issued by the Lord-Lieutenant under the direction of my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary. The first attack, if I may use the expression with all deference, of my noble friend was with regard to regulation No. 1, which insists that there shall be absolute equality of treatment between all vendors. He challenged that and seemed, as far as I could gather, to wish that there should be some differentiation made between the various classes of vendors and vendees. I confess I am utterly at a loss to understand the argument put forward by my noble friend. I always understood that the sum of money allocated annually for the purpose of promoting the transfer of land was to be given on the principle of first come, first served; in other words, that those applicants who had, directly the Act was passed, taken advantage of it were to receive the benefit of their foresight. The idea that any vendor or class of vendors should be given any undue preference over any other vendor or class of vendors was absolutely contrary to the desires and wishes of His Majesty's Government in passing the Act of 1903, and therefore an opportunity was taken by the Irish Executive to point out once and for all that there was to be no differentiation whatever, but that those who applied first would be the first when the money was paid out to derive benefit from the Act.

The regulation most criticised by the noble Earl is the second, or "intimidation" regulation. My noble friend, who spoke so eloquently on this subject, declared that it was not the duty of the Commissioners to find out who were guilty of intimidation; but I did not gather from him whether he meant to convey that, if intimidation was proved, those who were guilty of it were to be placed on the same footing as law-abiding citizens. My noble friend seemed to consider that the regulation debarring those who were guilty of intimidation from deriving the benefits under the Act which would otherwise accrue to them was a new idea of my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary. Let me say at once that this is not a new principle. As long ago as 1898 the Congested Districts Board issued the following resolution—

> "We do not, however, intend to permit our desire to assist one class to lead us to participate in, or countenance, an injustice to another class. If the financial obstacles which at present stand in the way are removed in the manner suggested, we shall be prepared to purchase, at what appears to us to be fair value, any property or tenants' interest that may be freely offered to us, or may be for sale in the Land Judge's Court, provided we can see our way to utilise them economically for the purposes under consideration. But we hope it will be clearly understood that any attempt to bring undue or unfair pressure to bear on landlords or tenants in order to induce them to sell their properties will only defeat its own object."

This was signed by the various members of the Congested Districts Board, and amongst the names is that of the temporary member, Father O'Hara. I mention this to show my noble friend that this regulation is not a new one. It has been the policy of His Majesty's Government all along, in permitting the transfer of land, to insist as far as they could on the transfer being carried out in an amicable spirit. Then, again, I would remind my noble friend that in 1900 the late Chief Secretary, Mr. Wyndham, in a letter to Lord Clonbrock wrote—

> "You are quite right in believing that the Government have not the slightest intention of countenancing any form of intimidation practised for the purpose either of coercing persons to sell who are unwilling to do so, or of depreciating the value of property with a view to prospective sale."

My noble friend will probably ask, why is this intimidation clause inserted in the regulations? If he will tell me there is no intimidation whatever I shall be very glad to argue the question with him; but I think I shall be able to show that there has been such intimidation that it was the bounden duty of His Majesty's Government to give this instruction. My noble friend behind me, Lord Clonbrock, has given a practical illustration of what is taking place in the county of Galway, of which he is lieutenant, and the Earl of Arran has told your Lordships his experience in the county of Mayo. I do not think, therefore, that my noble friend can say that this regulation was unnecessary or uncalled for.

As far as I could gather from the remarks that have been made, there seems to be some doubt as to what is intimidation and how it is to be brought home. Intimidation is defined in the Act of 1887 as—

> "Any words or acts intended or calculated to put any person in fear of any injury or danger to himself, or to any member of his family, or to any person in his employment, or any fear of injury to or loss of his property, business, or employment."

I will quote to your Lordships a letter, written by the United Irish League, which, to my mind, proves beyond all doubt that it was the duty of His Majesty's Government to guard against intimidation. It is a letter written by a secretary of the United Irish League to the Estates Commissioners, in which he says—

> "We, the members of the above branch of the United Irish League, beg to request the Estates Commissioners to fully ascertain and investigate into all the circumstances before any agreements are entered into as between Lord ——— and his tenants; and we hereby warn you to be prepared to accept the responsibility of any unpleasantness that may arise should any portion of the outside lands be scheduled as demesne land."

I do not know whether my noble friend considers that intimidation.

THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN: I never doubted for a moment that there was intimidation; nor did I use any argument against dealing with intimidation. My argument was that the Estates Commissioners were not the proper persons to deal with it.

*THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: As the noble Earl says he does not think the Estates Commissioners are the people to deal with it, I would ask who are to decide what is intimidation? I have here a number of resolutions, which I do not think I need read to your Lordships, that have been passed by branches of the United Irish League, which I consider are of a most intimidating character. Does the noble Earl propose that this Act, which was carried through both Houses of Parliament in order to afford a satisfactory and amicable settlement of this question, should be made void owing to intimidatory notices? I do not suppose there is anyone in your Lordships' House who has advocated more consistently than I have the transfer of land from owner to occupier on terms amicable to both as a solution of the Irish problem, and I say that if that process is to be carried out in an amicable spirit it must be safeguarded against intimidation. I hold that it was the bounden duty of the Chief Secretary and of the Lord-Lieutenant to insist upon regulations such as these being passed in order to prevent the intimidation which they believe is taking place.

Now I pass to the third regulation, which was dealt with at considerable length by my noble friend. It is the regulation which deals with the question of reinstating evicted tenants in their holdings. My noble friend does not recognise the difficult position in which these dupes of the Plan of Campaign are placed. What my noble friend seems to think is that an evicted tenant can be reinstated at a moment's notice. That is an absolute impossibility. The Act points out that the question of the reinstatement of an evicted tenant can only be considered by the Land Commissioners when that estate as a whole comes before them; consequently to contend that the evicted tenants have not been fairly dealt with is to state an argument that cannot hold water. Even if the landlords desire that the evicted tenants should be reinstated, there are no holdings for them to go back to. These farms have been taken by others in the meantime. As my noble friend Lord Clonbrock has stated, the evicted tenants desire to remain in the county in which they lived before eviction, and they would not wish to be taken from, say, Galway to Wexford: they wish to live where they were born and bred. But, as I have said, there are no holdings for them to go back to. That is a matter which I think my noble friend ought to consider before he talks so glibly about the reinstatement of the evicted tenants.

My noble friend went on to speak of the necessity of enlarging the various holdings, and seemed to think that if they were enlarged it would be possible to reinstate the evicted tenants in some of these holdings. I speak subject to correction, but I am informed that the amount of absolutely untenanted land in Ireland in districts where the men would care to be reinstated is very small. Then, again, if you are to get this land in order to reinstate the evicted tenants you must make it worth while for the tenants in possession to go out. Their only alternative is to migrate to some other part of the country or to go abroad, but they are not going to be such fools as to give up their farms without receiving ample compensation for their tenant rights. Again, who is going to pay that compensation in order to replace an evicted tenant, who, through his own shortcomings, is not still in possession of the farm. The action of the landowners has not been to deal harshly with these people. Their action has been, as far as lay in their power, to assist in the reinstatement of tenants where they thought it advisable. We are told they have not done this. My answer is to refer noble Lords to the *ad interim* Report of the Estates Commissioners, in which they say—

> "In those instances where the Commissioners have required the owners to sell to them untenanted land other than demesne land in their occupation for the enlargement of uneconomic holdings the owners have invariably complied with their request."

When my noble friend says the Act has failed because it has not reinstated the evicted tenants, I should like him to tell me definitely how he would propose to reinstate these people after the arguments I have put forward.

There is one other point to which I must allude. It is said that however well the Act may have worked in other parts of Ireland, it has not been working well in Connaught. I quite agree that my noble friend was justified in drawing this deduction from the fact that the amount advanced for the purchase of land in Connaught was considerably less than that for the other provinces. But there are two reasons for that. One of the reasons has been alluded to by my noble friend behind me—I refer to the intimidation that has existed in the province of Connaught with regard to the great grazing lands. But the second and principal reason why the same amount of money has not been taken up in Connaught as in the other provinces is that already a great quantity of land has changed hands. The conclusions sought to be deduced from the Estates Commissioners' Report are to a certain extent defective. It is overlooked that the Congested Districts Board has also been operating in Connaught. That Board, between the years 1896 and 1903, bought estates of the value of £582,000. and under the Act of 1903 they have agreed to buy estates of the value of £884,940. Moreover, a great many of the estates in Connaught have been sold in recent years under Section 40 of the Act of 1896 and otherwise.

Each noble Lord who has taken part in this debate has justly laid stress on the fact that there is a considerable block in the progress of the working of the Act of 1903, and this has been clearly attributed to want of funds. I cannot, however, allow that the Act has been a failure; nor can I allow that the action of the staff is in any way deserving of censure. On the other hand, I consider the staff worthy of the highest praise. For many years past you have had land sold under the various Acts, but never has so much land passed from owner to occupier as during the time that this Act has been in force. It has been the ardent desire of the Irish Executive to facilitate that transfer so far as their power allowed them, and it must be remembered that they are restricted to a certain amount of money annually. They have never hesitated, when it was necessary, to augment the staff requisite for the administration of the Act.

Undoubtedly the main cause of the block is connected with the question of money. When the Act was introduced the late Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Chancellor of the Exchequer pledged themselves that for the first three years they would not demand more than £5,000,000 a year to be advanced to

Ireland for the purchase of land. I believe that my right hon. friend the late Chief Secretary stated that after three years he hoped to mend the pace. That was his expression, and I have no doubt that after the lapse of three years it may be possible for that to be done; but I cannot make any pledge or promise in the matter. My noble friend Lord Dunraven stated that he knew His Majesty's Government realised the difficulties and the block which at the present moment are doing injury both to owners who have agreed to sell and to tenants who have agreed to buy. I am here merely to explain the position, and I can inform noble Lords that the Government are considering the question from every point of view, and realise as much as anyone of your Lordships the difficulties and hardships under which both owners and occupiers of land who desire to come to an agreement are suffering at the present moment. The Chief Secretary is considering how this matter can be met, and I understand that early next week my right hon. friend proposes to make a statement in the House of Commons on the subject.

*THE EARL OF WESTMEATH: My Lords, I shall not detain the House for more than a few minutes. I sincerely congratulate my noble friend Lord Dunraven on the excellent speech he made, and on the very different tone he adopted from that which he displayed on the last occasion that he addressed your Lordships on Irish matters. It is a very good sign, I think, of the improved condition of the country under its new Administration that the noble Earl should take such a tone, and with the exception of his remarks upon regulation No. 2, I think he said very little with which we cannot all agree. In fact, if his mental development continues to progress, I see no reason why he should not in time become a useful and valued member of the Landowners' Convention. My reason for rising to-night is to express my disappointment that the noble Marquess who has replied on behalf of His Majesty's Government has not been able to give us any encouragement with regard to the money question, which is really at the bottom of the whole difficulty. Intimidation and other questions are all sufficiently serious, but at the bottom of the whole difficulty is this question of cash. If a landlord sells, he only gets 3½ per cent. interest on the purchase money, minus the bonus, and it is by no means certain that he always gets that. In the meantime, he may be paying, as I am paying, interest on heavy mortages at 5 or 4½ per cent. If that is to go on indefinitely, the position will be absolute ruination.

The noble Marquess laid stress on the fact that an arrangement was made that only so much money was to be raised during the three years. That was made under a total misapprehension. The people responsible for the Bill did not think it would work in the way it has worked. I most sincerely think that it is the bounden duty of His Majesty's Government to help us in this matter, even if it has to be done at a loss. We have been placed in this difficulty through no fault of our own. The Government have got us into it and they must get us out of it. The noble Earl alluded to taking payment in stock instead of cash. The great inducement in the passing of the Land Act was that we should get actual payment in gold instead of land stock. I do not know whether any such scheme as that to which the noble Earl referred is in contemplation by the Government, but I think I can assure them that nothing will induce us to accept depreciated land stock in payment after the promises we have received. How could we possibly afford to do so? I speak strongly lest the Government, finding themselves in a difficulty, might possibly hit upon some such method as this and try to bring pressure upon us to accept it. I can say that nothing will induce us to do so, and we shall not submit tamely to such treatment as that. We were promised payment in cash, and we ought to get it. If it is true that the Chief Secretary is going to make a statement on this subject next week, I hope that he will realise that these are the views, so far as I have been able to gather them, of those who are entitled to speak as representatives of the Irish landlords.

CONVOCATIONS OF THE CLERGY BILL.

[H.L.].

[SECOND READING].

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I shall not detain your Lordships long by what I have to say about this very simple Bill. The matter is not new to your Lordships, and the provisions of the Bill are so obvious as not to call for very much explanation. The Bill has two quite simple and innocent purposes. It has been stated outside that this Bill is an instance of ecclesiastical assumption and arrogance, and an attempt to give new powers to the clergy as contrasted with the laity. The answer to that is perfectly obvious—read the Bill. It does not attempt to do anything of the kind. It gives no powers of practical action which Convocation does not now possess. What it does do is to give Convocation power to remove two obstacles which stand in the way of its doing its own internal work effectively. As regards the demand for the Bill, I may state that all circles of Churchmen who have made their voice heard on any of these matters have been, as far as I know, almost unanimous on the subject. The Houses of Laymen, bodies carefully chosen of representative laymen, as well as Diocesan Conferences lay and clerical, have with practical unanimity asked for it, and there is, as far as I know, no difference of opinion on the subject among men who take an interest in these matters.

The Bill in its present form has already passed through this House. Four years ago it was introduced by my predecessor, Archbishop Temple, and the then Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, in advocating its Second Reading, said it might require further consideration at a later stage. It was accordingly considered most carefully, and was discussed clause by clause in Standing Committee, as may be seen by the verbal Amendment it received, and it subsequently passed through all its stages in your Lordships' House without difficulty. Convocation, whether we admire it or not, is an ancient factor in English constitutional life. It has grown in usefulness during the last few years, partly for the reason that it has systematically devoted itself to the particular work which is its own special province, but its constitution is a little cumbrous and unsuited to present circumstances. In the first place, the Southern Convocation, the Convocation of Canterbury, is less representative than we would like it to be of the parochial clergy. We desire that there should be fewer *ex officio* members and more elected members; indeed, that as it is nominally a representative body it should be a little more thoroughly representative than it is at present. The Northern Convocation, perhaps, requires very little reform in this respect, but the Southern Convocation, still working on its ancient constitution, seems to require a good deal. At the present moment some lawyers are of opinion that there is uncertainty and possibly some technical legal difficulty about the Convocations sitting together to discuss matters in common. When the original system for the constitution of the Church of England, with its Convocations in York and in London, took shape, it was a matter of many days journey to pass from York to London, or from London to York. We now take a shorter number of hours than we then took days for the journey, and it is exceedingly desirable that occasionally these bodies should be able to sit officially together in order to discuss matters of clerical or ecclesiastical importance. That is practically all that the Bill sets itself to do. Let me make it perfectly clear that it does not claim for Convocation any power of action which Convocation does not possess now; no single power of any kind that it has not got to-day; and even for the process of the reforms I have mentioned in its own internal organisation the Bill ensures the most absolute recognition of the Royal supremacy in the matter. All that we ask in this Bill is that the House should declare that in case any doubt arises on the subject there should be power for the Convocations—with the Royal Assent to start with, and the Royal Assent to end with, and with all the steps carefully guarded—to take such measures as are necessary to make its own internal organisation more workable. There are those in England who try to hamper the National Church in any reform of its system, because they dislike everything which promotes its efficiency. But that is not the kind of opposition which we have learned to look for in your Lordships' House. I can hardly suppose, therefore, that in this place anyone will take exception to a measure so moderate in its scope and so urgently demanded by those outside who have to deal with ecclesiastical affairs, and I would again remind the House that the Bill exactly as it now stands has already been agreed to by your Lordships.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

EARL SPENCER: I waited before rising to see whether the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack would say anything on this Bill. I am afraid I cannot agree with the description of the Bill which was given by the most rev. Primate, though it may be the fact that the Bill is a very simple one brought in for a perfectly innocent purpose. It is quite true that the Bill passed through your Lordships' House some years ago, but there was hardly any debate upon it. There was, I believe, a slight alteration made in the Bill after it was introduced, but I think we may take it that this Bill and the other one are identical.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: It was merely a verbal alteration, and was made in the House itself.

EARL SPENCER: I quite agree; it did not alter the Bill in any sense. The Prime Minister of the day, Lord Salisbury, spoke on the Second Reading, stating that he thought it a harmless measure, and that, if there were any objections to it, it could be amended in Committee. It is quite true that that Bill eventually passed your Lordships' House. I have examined the Bill now before us, and I maintain that it is a very serious constitutional innovation. Under this Bill a Convocation which is strictly clerical may impose the law on the laity of the Church.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: No.

EARL SPENCER: Well, that is an interpretation which has been put upon it by a legal friend of mine.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: Will the noble Earl show me where the Bill does that?

EARL SPENCER: It enables you to declare a new constitution, and the election of members to Convocation is to be regulated by Convocation itself. That imposes a new law on Convocation which indirectly affects the laity.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): It is clear that the canons of Convocation would not bind the laity.

EARL SPENCER: But they have an important bearing on matters connected with the Church, and they, therefore, indirectly affect the laity. Another very serious matter is the proposal that if the King in Council approves a resolution of Convocation, then it should be as binding as an Act of Parliament. A material change in the law might thus be made without Parliament being consulted. There are a great many people in this country who hold strongly that if there is to be a material alteration in the constitution of Convocation, that alteration should have the sanction and be directed by Parliament and not by Convocation itself. This is not such a very simple matter as the most rev. Primate thinks. It has been asserted that on occasions when the two Convocations have met together they have discussed very important matters, and on one occasion they came to the conclusion that there should be a complete reform of the law regulating ecclesiastical matters. There was one resolution passed, with only one dissentient, in which the opinion was expressed that the present tribunal which settles all the higher points of ecclesiastical law—namely, the Privy Council with Bishops added—should be altered, and that a Court should be constituted consisting of the Bishops of the land in which the lay element was very feebly represented. I cannot help thinking that this Bill looks like a step in the direction of making very serious changes in the law and giving Convocation greater power as against the laity.

I feel strongly upon this matter, and I could not allow the Second Reading of the Bill to go through without raising this protest; and I am not at all sure that I shall not feel it necessary to divide against it.

LORD COLERIDGE: My Lords, it seems to me that there are grave objections to this Bill. It is not a very slight Bill, as the most rev. Primate described it. It is necessary to pass this Bill because otherwise Convocation cannot, owing to the statute of Henry VIII., alter its constitution; and, therefore, this Bill permits Convocation to do what is now contrary to the statute and custom law of the country. It may not be in this particular instance that any very large development of fresh powers is intended; but the principle is here and it is a principle which is capable of very formidable extension. We have had, of late years, too much legislation by Rules, Regulations, Orders in Council, and the like, and there is nothing, if this Bill becomes law, to stand between the passing of a new constitution which Convocation may frame for itself without any examination on the part of Parliament, nothing except the dissent of the Minister of the day. If the Minister of the day chooses to give his assent to the scheme, or to the power which is exercised under this Bill, then it becomes law without any investigation by, or authority of, Parliament. It may be that it is not a very important matter whether the Convocations of York and Canterbury meet together or not. Nothing very large would turn upon that. No one would desire to prevent the Convocations meeting together as, and when, they please, but the objection that I take to this Bill is that it introduces an absolutely new principle which is capable of far wider application. The most rev. Primate said the laity were not affected. That is partly true, but it is not wholly true. Let me give the most rev. Primate an instance. Convocation may, according to this Bill, reorganise itself, and in its newly reorganised state it can do things that certainly affect the laity. It can, for instance, dictate to the clergy at what hours they shall marry the laity.

Earl Spencer.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: No, no.

LORD COLERIDGE: The most rev. Primate may be accurate, but I do not think so. They could alter, so far as the clergy were concerned, the hours at which they could perform the matrimonial rite. At any rate, in whatever form they sit, their actions must have a bearing upon the laity. It may be that in many cases they may have very little bearing, but I can conceive cases in which they would have a great bearing; and therefore, we have in this Bill an attempt to enable Convocation to override the statute law of the country and reconstitute itself in a manner which has hitherto been impossible and which may vitally affect the laity. As I strongly object to the principle of the Bill, I hope the noble Earl will persist in his intention to divide against it.

LORD HENEAGE: My Lords, if I had the fears entertained by my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition I should certainly be inclined to vote with him against the Bill, but it appears to me that the objections to the measure have been greatly exaggerated. I do not think it will have any of the fearful effects which the noble Earl appears to imagine. The Bill, so far as it goes, is in my humble opinion a good Bill. I am no great admirer of Convocation as it is, and if this Bill does anything it certainly will improve it. In the first place, it will give a better representation to the parochial clergy, which is very much to be desired; and, in the second place, Convocations will be allowed to meet together. I think it would be a good thing if, instead of talking miles apart, they were to meet together and discuss things in a practical way. The only direction in which the statute law can for one single moment be said to be over-ridden is that they may obtain leave by Order in Council that the two Convocations should meet together, and that is such a good thing that I shall support the Bill.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: My Lords, I can assure the most rev. Primate that I am not one of those who desire in the slightest degree to hamper the action of the Church. I believe our Church as a State Church is a great blessing to this country, and anything I can do to strengthen it in its action for good I am only too willing to do. I am sorry, therefore, to have to criticise the Bill the Second Reading of which has been moved to-day by the most rev. Primate. I have the utmost confidence in his broad view in respect of Church matters, and I am sure the interests of the Church and of the people are safe in his hands; but I have one or two objections to this Bill. I think the noble and learned Lord opposite, Lord Coleridge, rather overstated the effect of the Bill. I do not think for one moment that any canon passed by Convocation under the Bill could alter anything approaching the doctrine of the Church. I understand that the Bill is confined simply to giving power to Convocation itself to effect alterations in its constitution and in the mode of election of its members, but, even with that moderate reading of the Bill, I take exception to it on broad principle. I believe there was no result of the Reformation so great as that which placed the Church in this country under the control of Parliament; and anything that is done to weaken the power of Parliament in controlling the Church will, in my opinion, be injurious to the Church itself, and lessen the support of the people of this country. We should not cast doubt upon the power of Parliament in any way, or lessen the power of Parliament in dealing with the Church.

May I venture to suggest to the most rev. Primate that, if there is this evil existing in the constitution of Convocation, the representatives of Convocation should come to Parliament and ask for a remedy to be made. There would, I am sure, be no hostility. I believe there would be no attempt to hamper the passing of such a Bill, but, on the other hand, there would be a strong desire to enable full reform to be carried out where necessary. In such a case Parliament would be on its honour to do its duty, and would not refuse to grant the reform needed. I read this Bill in this way, that if it were passed and Convocation, ever so foolishly, went wild in its views of sacerdotalism and carried a measure which the country as a whole thought a great evil, the power of Parliament to remedy that would have been taken away. Whilst this is a very small measure as it is now drawn up, it raises the question which shall be supreme, the Church within itself or Parliament outside the Church.

Convocation cannot act independently. There is, of course, the check of the King in Council; but what does that mean? It means simply the Minister of the day. At any rate, it is putting individual responsibility in place of the responsibility of Parliament, and I confess, without endeavouring to make too much of this Bill, I cannot help feeling that the importance of the measure has been much under-rated. There is this practical question, What course are your Lordships to take? I could not myself give support to this Bill, but I would deprecate any division on the Second Reading. I would, therefore, suggest to the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition, sharing with him the view he entertains. whether it would not be more fair, no notice having been given to the most rev. Primate that a division would be taken, that the Bill should be read a second time, and the further criticism reserved till another stage.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, this is a Bill which does involve an important principle, and I should like to ask the most rev. Primate for a further explanation of the phraseology of Clause 2, which is by no means clear. It may be that in each case the two Convocations would have to apply to the Crown for permission to meet together, but it seems to me that they might once for all ask leave to meet together whenever they pleased, and that that power, once granted, might be a continuing power to Convocations to combine whenever they liked. Is that intended?

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: It has that intention.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: It is not intended that they should apply from time to time?

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: No.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: Convocations are little more than ecclesiastical debating societies, and this Bill would give them power only to make canons as to their mode of election and representation. It would not give them any power to make general canons. But so long as you have an Established Church in England it is essential for the continuance of that Church that the power of the Crown and of Parliament should be effective. If you turn this ecclesiastical assembly into a body in which the democratic and ecclesiastical and sacerdotal elements are brought into greater contrast and possible conflict, the strain between the Church and the State is in danger of being very much accentuated. As I understand it, the idea is to have a synod of the National Church, a meeting of the whole Church, and not in provinces. If you do get leave from time to time to meet in what may be called by ecclesiastical organisations a synod of the Church, and if that synod does pass violent and extreme resolutions, we shall be told that they represent the living voice of the spiritual Church and must be taken as guidance to the faithful although they have not the force of canons, and ecclesiastical intimidation will be brought to bear against recalcitrant clergy. I have all along been an advocate of the separation of Church from State, and anything which accentuates the strain will to my mind quicken that result; but so long as we have an Established Church it is important that the absolute supremacy of the Crown, that is, of Parliament, should be maintained.

THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS: My Lords, I acknowledge the very conciliatory language used in connection with this Bill by my noble and learned friend Lord James of Hereford. I noticed with pleasure one statement he made, that if hereafter it should be necessary to appeal to Parliament for specific powers to reform Convocation, that application would be considered in no hostile spirit. I hope it will not be necessary to appeal for such specific powers. If I am rightly advised, it is questionable whether it is not possible for the Sovereign himself to give these powers to Convocation without the necessity of our coming to Parliament at all for the purpose. But it seems to me that the most rev. Primate, by the course which he has adopted, has desired to take Parliament completely into his confidence in this work of reforming the constitution of Convocation, and not to have recourse simply to the powers of the Throne alone.

Your Lordships may have been impressed with the arguments from the other side of the House that this is a Bill for considerably increasing the powers of the clergy. On the contrary, it is a Bill which has been earnestly desired by the laity, and it is more from the point of view of the laity than that of the clergy that I desire to ask Your Lordships to support it to-day. It has been impossible in this House hitherto to refer to what the laity have already done by way of representation, but every effort has been made to bring the Houses of Laymen of the provinces of Canterbury and York into connection with the Convocations, so that the clergy and representatives of the laity may debate what is good for the Church. In the course of these discussions it has become clear that the Houses of Laymen are not yet adequately representative of the laity, and at the present moment a scheme is being carried through those Houses for the purpose of making them thoroughly representative. But the laymen turn to us, the clergy, and say, "If we are permitted to make our House more thoroughly representative of the laity, we ask you to see that your House of Convocation is made more thoroughly representative of the clergy." This is a reasonable demand. It is surely for the advantage of Parliament and the country that there should be a thoroughly representative body by which the mind of the Church can be authoritatively ascertained on any question. So far as the laity is concerned, no Parliamentary power is required. It is possible for the Houses of Laymen to be reformed in such a manner as I trust will make them thoroughly representative of the laity of the Church of England without Parliamentary power, but it is not apparently possible for the Lower Houses of Convocation to be reformed without some kind of statutory recognition. It may be possible, but it is a legal point, and it is on the assumption that perhaps it is necessary to obtain some Parliamentary recognition that the most rev. Primate has introduced this Bill. If it is the case, therefore, that it is the laity who are really pressing for this reform, and not merely the clergy, then I venture to say it would not be a graceful act towards the laity to deny to them what they in such large numbers are asking.

I myself, before I became a Bishop, was a Proctor of Convocation; I represented about 400 incumbents. When I became Bishop of Newcastle I found there were only 175 incumbents in that diocese, but they had four representatives, whilst I was the sole representative of 400 incumbents in the South. This is only a specimen of the anomalies which exist at the present time, and I venture to think it is not for the advantage of the Church that the anomalies should be allowed to continue. It is for the Church's advantage that there should be thoroughly efficient representation. This Bill confers no new powers whatever on Convocation. It is simply a Bill for the recognition of the right to reform Convocation and to permit the two Convocations to sit and confer together. I do not find one line in the Bill which confers fresh powers. The noble and learned Lord opposite spoke of the possibility of the clergy in Convocation altering the hours of marriage. The noble Lord must surely have forgotten that a special statute was needed to extend the legal hours of marriage from 12 to 3, and this is hardly consistent with the noble and learned Lord's contention that Convocation can fix the hours for marriage. The hours of marriage have been fixed by Parliament, and it seems to me that the view taken by the noble and learned Lord is altogether exaggerated. While there are points in the Bill which may require attention in Committee, I cannot but hope that your Lordships will give it a Second Reading.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, surely the appeal of the right rev. Primate is the best possible proof that further powers are being asked for in this Bill, because if there were no further powers asked for there would be no necessity for the passing of the Bill. I think the right rev. Prelate abundantly proved that Convocation required fresh powers in order to enable them to do certain things. Convocation apparently desires to pass for itself a sort of Redistribution Bill in order that there may be better representation upon it. I think this is a very natural and a very desirable object; but the point we wish to make on this side of the House is that this is not a thing which should be given to Convocation to do. It would be an abrogation of the powers of Parliament. Parliament should itself exercise the powers demanded, and should take into its own hands the regulations and rules under which this redistribution should be made. It is not a question whether the powers are desirable or not. Most of us would agree that they are desirable; but we think they are powers which should be reserved to Parliament and should not be handed over to Convocation. I understand that the most rev. Primate did not expect a division to be taken, but on a Bill of this character I do not think notice of intention to divide the House should be expected. I do not think we should be doing anything unreasonable or unfair if we divide, and as we on this side of the House do feel somewhat strongly with regard to the Bill we shall be obliged to take a division upon it.

*LORD STANMORE: My Lords, I should like to know whether my noble friend who has just sat down is aware of the fact that the existing constitution of Convocation is in no way due to Parliament. I speak under correction in the presence of so many noble and learned Lords, but I speak with absolute confidence when I say that I believe no single enactment can be found in the Statute-book by which Parliament attempts to regulate the constitutional powers or action of Convocation. The two bodies are, and always have been, entirely separate and independent. But my object in rising was to appeal to the House to regard the question primarily from the practical point of view, although, of course, theoretical considerations cannot be altogether omitted. We have here an admitted practical defect which this measure seeks to remedy. That evil is that the dignified clergy are over-represented in Convocation—that the beneficed clergy are inadequately represented—and that the unbeneficed clergy are not represented at all. That is a practical evil. How do you propose to remedy it?

Admitting the evil and the desirability of remedying it, what is the way in which that can be done? My noble friends Lord Tweedmouth and Lord James of Hereford have both appealed to Parliament to do it; but surely Parliament as at present constituted is one of the last bodies to which you would submit the details of a scheme for the reform of the constitution of Convocation. Is it to be debated in Parliament whether curates are to have so many members or none, or in what proportions the dignified and beneficed clergy are to be represented? Is it to be supposed that, hard as it is to find time for its own work, Parliament would consent to frame a Clerical Constituencies Re-distribution Bill? I think everyone will admit that Convocation itself is better fitted to reform its own mode of election and representation than Parliament would be. Moreover, there is this objection to resort to an Act of Parliament, that it would be on the part of Convocation a surrender which you cannot expect from Convocation, and which Convocation ought not to make—a surrender of its claim to be a body entirely independent of Parliament. It is for that reason that this Act is formed in a declaratory manner. There are doubts whether Convocation has already the power to reform itself, but many able lawyers are of opinion that it has that power and might legally exercise it, and it is only *ad majorem cautcham* to make matters quite safe that it is thought desirable to bring in this Bill. I appeal to the House to look at the matter from the practical point of view rather than enter into theoretical considerations as to what might, in practically inconceivable circumstances, possibly result from it. If we are to have a division, do not allow it to be taken with a House such as that I see before me. Let the division be taken when there is a fair attendance, and when the decision may be really representative of the views of the House.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I think it is desirable that I should call the attention of the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition to the fact that in the present condition of the House, if there was a division and the Bill was rejected, I should, under the rules, have to declare that the question was not decided, and it would be adjourned until the next meeting of the House. No notice that the Bill was going to be opposed has been given. I do not say that that was absolutely necessary; but I am sure that if the most rev. Primate had supposed that there was to be a division he would have been supported by more than one right rev. Prelate. A division taken in the present condition of the House would be rather in the nature of a snap division. I hope, therefore, that the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition will allow the Bill to be read a second time.

EARL SPENCER: I cannot agree to the Second Reading, but I am prepared to consent to the adjournment of the debate.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: If the noble Earl prefers that course, well and good; but I think it would be discourteous to insist on a division now.

EARL SPENCER: I may say that I have no wish to do anything that is unusual or unfair, but I think I had a perfect right to move the rejection of the Bill. I did not consider myself bound to give notice to the most rev. Primate that I was going to oppose the Bill, but I shall be prepared, as I have said, to consent to the adjournment of the debate.

Amendment moved—

"That the debate stand adjourned."—(*The Earl of Feversham.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to, and further debate adjourned *sine die.*

DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, this Bill has passed through the House of Commons by a large majority. It was also committed to, and passed by, the Standing Committee on Law. The principal object of the Bill is to extend to Ireland the powers fo the protection of persons and property against drunkards which were given to England by the Licensing Act of 1902. I understand that there will be one or two Amendments put down when the Bill is in Committee, and I think it better, therefore, that I should postpone dealing with these points until we reach the Committee stage, which I hope your Lordships will allow me to take on Monday next.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Mayo.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, I have no objection to the substance of the Bill, but I think it right to inform the noble Earl that there are two provisions which I shall think it my duty to refer to in Committee.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

PUBLIC MEETINGS (FACILITIES) BILL [H.L.].

[THIRD READING.]

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Lord Burghclere.*)

THE EARL OF FEVERSHAM: My Lords, I wish to express my satisfaction that His Majesty's Government have not given any support to this Bill. I do not propose, in the present condition of the House, to move its rejection, but I protest strongly against the Bill. The noble Lord in charge of it did not state any grievance on the part of any particular individual on the ground of permission not being given for public meetings, and we know, as a matter of practice, that it is usual to give leave for public meetings to be held in these schools; but it is a very different thing, in the case of schools which are erected and carried on by private individuals and managers, to make it compulsory that they should be available for public meetings. Those who promote this Bill think more about political agitation than they do about the interests of parochial schools, and I, for one, cannot believe that it is in the interests of the education of the people that these schools should be at the disposal of political agitators, who are empowered by it to go into a parish and say, whether the managers of the school like it or not, that they must allow their school to be made the arena of political discussion. I did not like the Third Reading of the Bill to pass without making this protest.

On Question, Bill read 3ª. Drafting Amendments made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 14th July, 1905.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Andover Lighting and Power Bill; Great Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Gosport and Fareham Tramways Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

North East London Railway Bill; London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for the settlement of the hereditaments and property representing the estates devised by the Will, dated the 26th day of June, 1875, of the Right Honourable George Harry, Earl of Stamford and Warrington, and in such Will referred to as 'the Cheshire Estate'; and for other purposes." [Earl of Stamford's Cheshire Estate Bill [Lords.]

Earl of Stamford's Cheshire Estate Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the County of Middlesex Light Railways Order, 1901 (County of Middlesex Light Railways (Extension of Time) Order, 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the working and maintenance of the Moel Tryfan Undertaking of the North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways Company as a Light Railway and other matters (North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways (Light Railway) Order, 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COURT OF PROBATE DIVISION (HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE) (IRELAND).

Annual Account presented, of Receipts and Disbursements for the year ended 31st December, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACTS, 1858 AND 1876.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 8th July, 1905, declaring Bushire to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of The Superannuation Act, 1876 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES ACTS, 1879 AND 1884.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 12th July; *Mr. Cochrane*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 241.]

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (CLOSING ORDER, BOROUGH OF DARWEN).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Darwen, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for Hairdressers' and Barbers' Shops within the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3436 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Return ordered, "(I.) of the Companies registered during the year ended the 31st day of December, 1904, which filed a prospectus and to which certificates to commence business have been granted, stating—

(1) the date of registration;

(2) the date of the prospectus;

(3) the amount of the nominal capital;

(4) the amount of each share;

(5) the amount issued or to be issued otherwise than for cash;

(6) the amount offered for subscription in cash;

(7) the amount underwritten;

(8) the commission for underwriting;

(9) the minimum subscription required;

(10) the amount allotted before commencing business;

(11) the amounts per share payable on application and allotment;

(12) the total directors' share qualification, if any; and

(13) the date of the certificate to commence business.

(II.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1904 which filed a prospectus, but to which certificates to commence business have not been granted, stating the particulars specified in (I.) so far as they are applicable.

(III.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1904 which filed a declaration that the Company "does not issue any invitation to the public to subscribe for its shares."

(IV.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1904 which have not filed a prospectus or a declaration that the Company "does not issue any invitation to the public to subscribe for its shares," and stating the particulars specified in (I.) so far as they are applicable.

(V.) Of the Companies which were dissolved or struck off the register during the year 1904.

(VI.) Of the total number of Companies dissolved during the year 1904 (1) by order of the Court; (2) after voluntary liquidation; and (3) pursuant to the provisions of Section 7 of the Companies Act, 1880, and Section 26 of The Companies Act, 1900.

(VII.) Of the total number and nominal paid-up and considered as paid-up capital of the Companies registered during the year 1904 in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin respectively, distinguishing limited Companies from unlimited, and Companies registered with a nominal capital from Companies registered without such capital.

(VIII.) Of the total number and paid-up capital, including the amounts considered as paid on vendors and other shares, of all Companies having a share capital which were on the register on the 30th day of April, 1905, except such Companies as were in course of liquidation or removal from the register under the provisions of Section 7 of The Companies Act, 1880, and Section 26 of the Companies Act, 1900.

(IX.) Of the total number and nominal capital of the Companies registered in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively in every year since the commencement of the Companies Act, 1862, to 1904, inclusive.

(X.) Of the fees and capital duty paid in respect of Registered Companies during the year 1904."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

The Unemployed at Portsmouth.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the displacement of labour now occurring at Portsmouth Dockyard, and the congestion of unemployed with which the borough is in consequence confronted, His Majesty's Government will consider the possibility of endeavouring to render assistance by facilitating emigration or transfer of families to other parts of the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) No expression has as yet reached the Admiralty of any desire on the part of the workmen who are being discharged from the dockyards to emigrate. If representations are made showing that any considerable number of men desire to find work in the Colonies, and that employment is available for them on arrival, the Admiralty would be glad to consider what assistance could be given.

International Judicial Congress—Gambling in Futures.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the opinion expressed by Lord Cromer, as stated in his official Report for 1904 on Gambling in Futures and Options on the Bourses of Egypt, in conjunction with the resolution passed at the International Cotton Congress at Manchester on the 9th instant, he will consider the advisability of the Government instructing His Majesty's representatives in Egypt, who are at present sitting as members of the International Judicial Congress on the question of gambling in futures in that country, to advocate repressive international legislative measures for the joint benefit of Egypt and of manufacturers, operatives, and users; and whether he will give instructions that the official proceedings of the International Cotton Congress recently held in Manchester, and also those of the International Agricultural Congress lately held in Rome, be published in Blue-book form in the same way as Lord Cromer's Report on Egypt was published.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The hon. Gentleman has, I think, misapprehended the view expressed by Lord Cromer in his official Report for 1904, as the following passage will show: "On the other hand, most authorities hold the opinion, in which I venture to express my entire concurrence, that it is practically impossible, by legislation, to put a stop to speculation without, at the same time, causing great hindrance to trade in general. If anything is done, it will probably be in the direction of preparing a 'Réglement de Bourse,' . . ." In view hereof and of the fact that the resolution of the International Cotton Congress merely suggested certain technical alterations of trade practice, I do not think it would be expedient to act on the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman. I have no right to give any instructions as to the publication of the proceedings of the Cotton International Congress, which is an unofficial body, and as to the publication of the proceedings of the recent International Agricultural Congress, perhaps the hon. Gentleman will consult the President of the Board of Agriculture.

Gambling Operations in Cotton.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that, owing to the actions of the bears in Liverpool and in America forcing down the price of cotton after the Sully collapse in 1904 from 9d. per pound to the low price of 4d., the Southern Planters' Cotton Association have entered into a compact with the exchange gamblers of the latter country to reduce the acreage of cotton for 1905–6 by about 25 per cent., and that speculative advances have recently been operated in options and futures on the Liverpool and the United States cotton exchanges to the detriment of the Lancashire cotton industry, and likewise to the world's cotton trade generally; whether he will, in view of such artificial conditions, appoint a special Commission to inquire into and report upon transactions injuriously affecting international trade; and whether he will confer with President Roosevelt with the object of adopting some international co-operative endeavour in order to prevent a repetition of these international gambling operations in the shape of paper sales of fictitious products through option and future contracts.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am informed that no such compact is known to the Board of Trade, and its existence seems rather improbable. The price of cotton has recently advanced in consequence, as I am told, of the unexpectedly low official estimate of the coming crop. It is not proposed to take the steps suggested by the hon. Gentleman.

Report of the Royal Commission on Sewage Disposal.

Colonel LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can give any information as to when the Report of the Royal Commission on Sewage Disposal may be expected.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am informed that the Commission hope to issue a Report this year dealing with the relative merits of different methods of sewage disposal and certain other questions. I understand, however, that it cannot be stated at present when the final Report will be issued.

Assistant Postmen.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General if the conditions of employment of assistant postmen laid down in the Tweedmouth Report, and the conditions subsequently conceded as the result of the Norfolk-Hanbury Conference to auxiliary postmen doing somewhat less than five hours per day but receiving payment for five hours are still in force; and whether the men performing such duties are eligible for all the benefits, even though they have not entered the postmen's ranks through the Army, the Navy, or the telegraph messenger service.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Assistant postmen, who must be either ex-telegraph messengers or ex-soldiers and sailors, receive the benefits conceded under the Tweedmouth recommendations. The special concession given to certain auxiliary postmen performing less than five hours work a day, but receiving payment for five hours, applies to London postmen only. It was not the intention of the Duke of Norfolk and the late Mr. Hanbury to extend the concession to all auxiliaries working less than five hours.

Post Office—Annual Leave to Officers About to Retire.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the Postmaster General if the annual leave regulation which provides that annual leave is granted for the purpose of improving health, to enable an officer to render further services, applies to officers who reach the age limit during the year and who may resume duty for a short or long period after having been granted annual leave.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) There is no objection to the grant of annual leave to an officer whose retirement is approaching if he resumes duty for a reasonable period after the leave.

The Board of Trade and Mr. Brown's Invention.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the invention exhibited by Mr. John Brown at the meeting of the British Association in Belfast, whereby economy in time and convenience could be effected in the putting down and taking up of railway and tramway passengers; and whether he will order an official report to be made on the invention with a view to its adoption in these countries.

(*Answered by Mr. Bonar Law.*) The attention of the Board has not been drawn to this invention. The question of the adoption of such an appliance on railways and tramways is one for the consideration of the proprietors of those undertakings.

Government Contracts—Messrs. Waygood and the Fair Wages Clause.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether it has been represented to him that Messrs. Waygood & Company, liftmakers, who are now executing Government contracts at the new Sessions House, Old Bailey, and the Land Registration Office, is a non-union firm which makes it a condition of employment that none of its workers shall be members of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, or any other trade union, and that the conditions under which joiners and French polishers work are in violation of those sanctioned by the trades unions; and what action he intends taking in connection with these representations.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) In the first place I have to point out to the hon. Member that the First Commissioner is not responsible for the building or equipping of the new Sessions House, Old Bailey. The United French Polishers (London) Society has made a representation to the First Commissioner regarding the non-employment by Messrs. Waygood of union men. The First Commissioner, having made careful inquiry, is satisfied that Messrs. Waygood do not discriminate in any way as regards the employment of union or non-union workmen as engineers. It appears that in the polishing shop some men have been required to state whether they were unionists or not, but this has been done without the knowledge of the directors, who have given instructions that it shall not occur again under any circumstances.

Messrs. Waygood will, of course, be required to conform, in the execution of any Government work with which they may be entrusted, to the spirit and intention of the Resolution of the House of Commons of February 13th, 1891.

Payment of Annual Education Grant by Quarterly Instalments.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the question of the continuation of the payment of the annual education grant by quarterly instalments has now been definitely determined; and if so, in what manner.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Board have now arranged to continue for the current financial year, but for no longer, the same partial system of payment of annual grants by quarterly instalments as has been in force during the last two financial years.

Public Expenditure on Capital Account.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the total and the items of the estimate of the money which will be spent upon capital liabilities during 1905–6.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The estimated expenditure on capital account in the current year is £9,000,000, The amounts included for the respective heads of service are, approximately, as follows:—

	£.
Naval Works - - -	4,000,000
Military Works - - -	2,950,000
Telegraphs - - -	850,000
Public Buildings - -	255,000
Land Registry Buildings -	30,000
Public Offices, Dublin - -	15,000
Cunard Agreement - -	900,000
	£9,000,000

Rental of Sold and Unsold Portion of the King-Harman Estate.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners can ascertain from their negotiator, who represented the vendor, the total former rent of the portion of the King-Harman Estate sold to the tenants, and for which vesting orders will be issued; and also the total rent of the portions of this estate which now remain unsold.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The rental of the portion of this estate which has been purchased or agreed to be purchased by the Estates Commissioners is £17,752. The rental of the entire estate, as appears from the schedule lodged, is £19,224. The rental of the unsold portion is therefore £1,472.

Advances Exceeding £3,000 on the King Harman Estate.

MR. TULLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners can state (1) in how many cases on the King-Harman Estate have they agreed to advance to a purchaser a sum exceeding £3,000; and (2) in how many cases have they decided, or have they intimated through their inspector or negotiator, that they will not advance a sum exceeding £3,000 to the owner of grazing land or a non-residential holding.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) (1) In eleven cases. (2) In no case.

Woolwich Dockyard Building Contract—Messrs. Playfair and the Fair Wages Clause.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: To ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether Messrs. Playfair are carrying out a building contract in connection with Woolwich Dockyard; and whether, in connection with the contract the men employed are working the hours of work recognised by the Master Builders' Association and the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, namely, 6.30 a.m. to 5 p.m., or whether they have to begin work at an earlier hour at ordinary rates of wages.

(*Answered by Mr. Bromley Davenport.*) It would appear that the men employed on this contract are working overtime at ordinary rates of wages. Inquiry will be made of the contractors as to the practice.

South African War Honours for Army Medical Corps (Volunteers).

Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the Army Council has refused honours in connection with the South African War to the Royal Army Medical Corps (Volunteers), and that war honours have been granted to numerous Volunteer corps which sent contingents to the war, he will state what was the average strength of the contingents sent; and whether, in view of the fact that the eight divisions of Royal Army Medical Corps (Volunteers) in various parts of the country contributed to medical units during the war some 650 officers and men, amounting to two-fifths of their strength, the Army Council will reconsider its decision.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) It is not the custom to award honours to any but corps of cavalry and infantry, as it is accepted as a fact that all the other branches of the Army have contributed in some measure to every honour which is recorded on colour or accoutrement. Accordingly no honours for South Africa were awarded to Artillery, Engineer, Army Service, or Medical Corps, Regular or Auxiliary.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On the Order to go into Committee on this Bill.

Mr. BLACK (Banffshire) said that when this Bill was read a second time there had been standing on the Paper for some weeks an instruction to refer the Bill to a Committee of Scotch Members with fifteen English Members to be added by the Committee of Selection. That was a very usual kind of Motion upon Scotch Bills, and the last occasion upon which a similar Motion was adopted was in the case of the Scotch Licensing Bill in 1903. Such a Motion had been made upon other occasions, and it was in accordance with a Standing Order passed in 1893. At the proper time he rose in his place to move this Motion, the present Secretary to the Local Government Board being in the Chair, but instead of calling upon him, which would have been in accordance with precedent, he allowed the Bill to go automatically to a Committee of the Whole House. He believed it was generally recognised and admitted by the then occupant of the Chair, the clerks at the Table, and the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury that it was an error, and that he ought to have been called upon to move his Motion so that he might have taken a division upon it. He, therefore, submitted that he was entitled to move now. He understood that the Government had no objection to his Motion being considered now, and, seeing that he had been prevented from moving his Motion by an error from the Chair, he wished to know if he would be in order under these circumstances in moving his instruction now.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the Motion is not now admissible. The hon. Member states that by an oversight he was not called upon. I understand that the Deputy-Chairman did not hear the hon. Member, and I think the hon. Member ought to have insisted upon being heard.

Mr. BLACK: I did my best.

*Mr. SPEAKER: There is no power to interpose with a Motion of this kind now.

Mr. BLACK: Not if the House assents?

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) asked if it was not usual on the Second Reading for the Speaker to call upon a Member to move the Motion which stood in his name upon the Paper. In this case his hon. friend rose, made a Motion, and insisted, and he contended that the hon. Member could not have done more than he did.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I have nothing more to add. I think if the hon. Member had been a little more persistent he would have been heard.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3:—

Lord WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) moved to leave out the words "of the following educational districts" and substitute "county," and said that being an English Member he felt that some apology was due to the Committee in moving this Amendment. His only excuse was, however, that for a large part of the year he lived in Scotland, and he was a large ratepayer there. He desired that everything should be done for the benefit of education in Scotland, and his only wish was that if they were to have a good Bill to improve education in Scotland it should be worked in as cheap and efficient a manner as possible. He was strongly of opinion that the county was the proper area for education, both elementary and secondary, and he thought that opinion was shared by a large number of Scotch Members upon both sides of the House. He believed that the Lord-Advocate, in introducing this Bill, stated as his excuse for continuing the local government district for the new education authority that it was a compromise between those who wished to have the county area and those who preferred that the parish should remain the area for elementary education. Personally, he was not particularly fond of compromises, and they were often exceedingly unsatisfactory. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen had spoken strongly in favour of the county being made the area. He had stated that the county was the proper area for secondary education, and that no small area could deal efficiently with the secondary education required; and he further stated that the Government scheme was a most unsatisfactory compromise.

He thought they might take a lesson from what had occurred under the English Bill. During the whole time that the English Education Bill was in Committee there was a feeling prevalent amongst county Members that considerable expense would be entailed by these new proposals, and in many counties that expectation had been amply fulfilled, and the rates had gone up. However popular it might be on public platforms to talk of the merits and advantages of people being well educated, it was not, perhaps, so popular when the people were asked to pay the bill. The English Bill only set up some fifty authorities in the counties, but this Bill was setting up no fewer than 107 authorities in a country with a population far less than England and with a much smaller valuation. This would mean that there would have to be no less than 107 different staffs and sets of officials. Salaries would have to be paid to them all, and offices would have to be erected for them, and there would also be their expenses to pay; and considering that amalgamation might take place in the future there was a great danger that these officials, having been appointed, would consider that they had fixity of tenure, and would want compensation if they were turned out of their posts. It had been suggested by the hon. Member for Haddingtonshire that in addition to the expense of paying a host of officials the travelling expenses of the members of these authorities should be paid. He thought they ought to do their best to keep these expenses down. He was afraid there was a danger of them getting very near that state of things under which two-thirds of the population paid the other third for looking after them.

He submitted that if they were to start by making the county the area it would be easier for the counties to subdivide than for the districts to amalgamate. In these matters he had always found that it was easier to part than to come together. Shakespeare said that parting was such sweet sorrow. He thought it would be most difficult for the districts to amalgamate. The County Councils Association of Scotland had passed by thirteen votes to four a resolution in favour of the county area being selected instead of the district. The district areas had been set up simply to look after the roads, and it did not follow that that would be the best area for education. It was almost like the parish councillor who, in order to promote economy, suggested that instead of having two pipes for gas and water both these services should be supplied through one pipe. In many of the areas it would be exceedingly inconvenient for the members to attend the meetings, and, in his opinion, it would be far better to map out Scotland into completely new districts, taking the chief towns as the centre. There were several counties in Scotland in which it would be perfectly impossible, unless the rates were made absolutely stupendous to properly carry out the work of education. In Argyll there were seven districts with a population of 70,000 and a rateable value of £527,000. A penny rate in those districts would produce about £300, and that sum would not go far in paying salaries of officers, providing offices for them, and paying travelling expenses. In the county of Ross and Cromarty there were eight districts with a population of 76,000 and a valuation of £300,000. In this instance a penny rate would only produce about £150. Therefore, if they wished in some of these districts to carry on the work of education in a proper manner they would have to start at once with a shilling rate. He hoped that the Government would give this Amendment their earnest consideration. He thought that the Bill as it stood would be a very heavy charge upon poor country districts in consequence of the multiplication of these authorities and officials.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, to leave out the words, 'of the following education districts,' and insert the word 'county.'" — (*Lord Willoughby de Eresby.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

SIR CHARLES RENSHAW (Renfrew, W.) said this subject was very fully discussed in Committee last year, and there was a very considerable difference of opinion upon it. Those interested in this question were grateful to the Government for the changes they had made which would make it easier to work out the scheme of district boards as against county boards. His view was that the district area was a bad one. He appealed to the Government to allow the House to decide this question without putting pressure upon their supporters. A division upon this question would practically decide the numerous Amendments which were on the Paper upon this question. He did not think this was a question upon which any fresh light could be thrown by continuing the discussion.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): said this question was fully discussed last year on more than one occasion. After discussion, by no means regulated by Party lines, an Amendment similar to the one now before the Committee was withdrawn in view of certain Amendments promised by his predecessor. Those Amendments took the shape of a proviso giving the Secretary for Scotland very large powers of dividing and aggregating districts The present Bill differed from last year's Bill only in the respect that greater elasticity was given to those powers. He agreed there was a good deal to be said on both sides of the question raised by the Amendment; but, taking the whole matter into consideration, he thought no sufficient reason had been shown for departing from the view which prevailed last session. The noble Lord who introduced the Amendment did not propose to get rid of school boards. He did not propose that the county council should be the education authority. He proposed that the new school boards should have a larger area than the Bill gave. But the new school boards would require some officials, and there would be some expense whatever the area might be. He submitted that no reason had been shown for departing from the course taken last session, when it was decided that the local government district should be taken. It would adapt itself very well to all the requirements of education, and in view of the further facilities which had been given in the provision for special districts he adhered to the proposal in the Bill.

*MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said he would like to emphasise what had been said as to the extreme necessity of watching expenses in large and poor counties, especially in the Highlands. The proposal of the noble Lord was to make the county the alternative of the district. He thought the noble Lord was going to the wrong end of the argument. The point desired in the Highlands was to keep the parish as the foundation and the unit of the new organisation. In the Highland counties it was essential that this should be done. The districts into which these counties were divided were in themselves large even for local government work. In order to get persons to take an interest in education they must confine the area to the parish. Probably many hon. Members were not aware how large Highland counties were. He asked the House to consider the position of a Highland district split up into islands. He instanced the Island of Mull which was thirty or forty miles across. The district of Mull included the Island of Tiree. The Committee would see that there would be great difficulty, if it was not actually impossible, in getting members of the board to attend meetings because of the amount of travel by sea which the work would involve. He hoped the Lord-Advocate would be able to insert words in the proviso clause which would enable them to overcome this difficulty. He warned the right hon. Gentleman that if the Bill was to do good in the Highlands the parish should remain.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) said he was glad to hear that it was not the intention of the Lord-Advocate to depart from this fundamental particular in the scheme of the Bill. There were many who thought the Bill went too far already in the way of making the areas too large. If at this early stage the Government were going to adopt such a large and fundamental change in the Bill he thought it would augur unfavourably for the progress of discussion in Committee. The noble Lord had adduced two arguments in favour of his proposal. One was in regard to the question of expense, and the other was that opinion in Scotland was in favour of his proposal. The Lord-Advocate had already dealt with the question of expense, but he would add that the present system based on parish areas was much cheaper than the English system based on county areas. Of course, any change in machinery in a matter connected with education must increase expenditure, and he was perfectly certain that under this Bill one of the consequences would be to increase expense. It would be increased very much more if the suggestion of the noble Lord were adopted. The noble Lord quoted the opinions of county councils which were in favour of his proposal, and he was supported by the hon. Member for West Renfrewshire. The noble Lord spoke as a large ratepayer and proprietor in Perthshire, but he did not speak the views of the county council of Perth. He held in his hand a memorandum on this subject which had been distributed by the county council of Perth. The question submitted to county councils was: "Are county councils in favour of the proposal in the Bill, or do they desire the county area with power to sub-divide?" The answer of the county council of Perth was that they were in favour of the proposal in the Bill subject to a matter connected with the City of Perth which he need not go into. He hoped the proposed alteration would not be made at this early stage of the discussion.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.), on a point of order, sad the Amendment before the Committee raised the issue as between the county and the district as the area for secondary and elementary education. But there was another issue of great importance, and that was the issue between the district and the parish, which was the existing area. It would be very inconvenient to Members if they had to discuss both these issues together. He asked whether it would be possible to have a discussion now on the Amendment of the noble Lord, and also an opportunity later of discussing the other proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN expressed the opinion that there would be an opportunity on a subsequent Amendment of discussing whether the parish should be retained as the school board area.

THE EARL OF DALKEITH (Roxburgh) did not agree that the matter raised by the Amendment was settled last year. He understood that on that occasion further clauses were to be brought up to deal with it. He held distinctly that the county was more suitable as the area for secondary and technical education, but, with regard to elementary education, sub-division might in some cases be necessary. If the Government adhered to the district he hoped they would make provision for the transfer in particular cases of one or two parishes from one district to another.

Mr. BRYCE said he gathered that on this Amendment they must confine their remarks to the question of the county as against the district proposed. He thought everyone who had considered the subject, whether in regard to England or Scotland, had come to the conclusion that the county was the smallest area suitable for secondary education. One of the few points on which they were all agreed in discussing the English Education Bill was that the county was the smallest area that could be worked for secondary education. But if that were true of England, it was still more true of Scotland, where in most counties the population was so sparse. It would be impossible to organise secondary education in Scotland in a less area than a county, because there would neither be population nor revenue enough, nor all the other means which were necessary to work secondary education efficiently. What was wanted was a certain system of bursaries to enable clever boys to go on from the primary to the secondary schools, and from these to the University. Many of the parish schools in Scotland from of old down to our day had given a good secondary education to clever boys—especially in the North-East of Scotland. But, taking that country as a whole, secondary education could only be organised in counties. They could perfectly well have an organisation in every county for secondary education which might be constituted either of a body elected for the purpose or chosen from local school boards or other local authorities. All that was wanted was a body capable of speaking for the whole county. But he said, without hesitation, that the experiment which had been tried in England of placing elementary education on the county authorities had been a failure; and that the best educationalists in England now regretted that the county had been chosen as the area for the administration of elementary education. The county area was far too large. He knew counties where they had tried to remedy the evil by appointing local committees. After long discussion, when the Bill was before the House, they succeeded in getting a provision introduced which enabled the county authorities to allow local committees to be appointed. But he was told that these local committees, although they had diminished the bad effects of the county area, had not done away entirely with these bad effects. They had too little power; they had not that interest in elementary education which the older school boards had. What was wanted for elementary education was to associate the people themselves with the education of their children. Till forty or fifty years ago, the old parish schools of Scotland—although there was much to be desired in the improvement of their organisation—stood close to the people, who took the greatest interest in them and knew all that was passing in them. The school boards had also been in close touch with the people of all ranks and degrees. But if the county were made the area for elementary education how many wheelwrights and other artisans, ploughmen, small farmers, and other poor persons would be able to serve on the education authority and take part in the administration of the education of their locality.

Lord WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY said he had another Amendment lower down on the Paper by which he proposed to make the parish councils the managers of the parish schools subject to the supervision of the county councils.

Mr. BRYCE said that that would not by any means meet the difficulty which he foresaw. The local people would only be managers without any sense of responsibility, and, therefore, they could not be in anything like the position of independence the school boards enjoyed under the present system. There were managers under the English Act, but they had no power and had no responsibility. Therefore, to put it on no higher ground, they would lose the benefit of the assistance in educational work of a large class of people who were now taking part in the work of education; and they would put in their place men who could afford to pay the railway or coach fares to go to the place of meeting. There was another difficulty besides that of money—the question of time. A small farmer, or ploughman, or rural artisan could not possibly find the time or afford to lose a whole day's work in order to attend a county meeting. There was yet another difficulty. Where there was administration over a large area by a central body there was not that personal knowledge of the local needs of the localities, and the administration, therefore, fell into the hands of the officials. That had been the effect of the Education Act in England. It meant not only a loss of personal knowledge, but the doing of things by general rules instead of adjusting them to each particular case. It meant red tape, because it was only on general lines that officials would work; and that meant a loss of practical touch with the people. It likewise meant more expense, because the tendency of officialism was to increase expense and to demand a larger staff. These considerations seemed to him to be sufficient argument to induce the Committee to reject the proposal of the noble Lord. He was anxious to press this argument, for when they came to discuss the question as between districts and parish areas the same considerations would recur. He also wished to take the opportunity of calling the attention of English Members—whose attendance that afternoon he greatly appreciated—to the fact that the experience they had had in England was an inducement to them to help the Scotch Members in rejecting this proposal, which would destroy a system of educational administration which had done so much for Scotland in the past.

Mr. MAXWELL (Dumfries-shire) said that there were some districts in Scotland where the population was under 20,000 and where there was no secondary school or even a higher-grade school. In these districts, if they were to do anything for secondary education, they must either start a school of their own or combine with another district. But there was no provision in the Bill to compel two small districts to combine. It appeared to him that that was rather inconsistent, because they compelled Leith to combine with Edinburgh and Govan with Glasgow although there were in both these places thoroughly equipped secondary and technical schools. It appeared to him that if they were to build on the county area the Secretary for Scotland or a Commission should have the power, with all the facts before him or them, to divide the county into what would be the best areas for secondary education.

Mr. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire) said that he preferred the district as the area for the reasons which he gave last year and which he thought it unnecessary to repeat now. At the same time he entirely sympathised with his hon. friend when he said that in many cases the district would not be a sufficient area for secondary education and that they must have some plan to combine districts. Last year he proposed a clause to that effect, and the late Lord-Advocate gave him a distinct promise that it would be embodied in the Bill. He had put down a similar clause on the Paper, but he could find no provision in the Bill for carrying out the promise of the Lord-Advocate last year. Would the present Lord-Advocate give an assurance that such a provision would be inserted so as to carry out this most necessary arrangement?

Mr. BLACK said there were several degrees of goodness and badness in the proposals submitted to the House. He must say that the best scheme of all was to adopt the parish area for educational purposes in Scotland and work up from that to suitable areas for elementary, secondary, and technical education. That would give an *ad hoc* area for an *ad hoc* authority. He would put into the second degree of praise the proposal of the noble Lord opposite. They were all agreed that the county was the best area for secondary education, although it was too large for elementary education. There were only four counties out of thirty-three in Scotland which had a population exceeding 12,000 or 20,000. In a population of, say, 20,000 there was only 5 per cent. available for secondary education, and a secondary school with only 100 pupils could not pay the teachers sufficient salaries or provide adequate appliances. At the bottom of the list of proposals for badness he would put that of the Government, which adopted districts of counties formed for an entirely different purpose than that of education. He would vote for the proposal of the noble Lord not because it was a vote against the parish areas, but because it was a vote against the Government.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) said he did not agree with his right hon. friend the Member for Aberdeen that county areas were ideal areas for education. The county area was the paradise of officialism. Neither the county, the parish, nor the district was the ideal area. What was wanted was something which would be suitable for education, and it would not do to take for that purpose a district which from historic reasons was either a parish or a county. What ought to be done in Scotland with regard to education was what was done for local government. A Boundary Commission should be appointed to consider the means of transport from one quarter to another with the object of ascertaining if, in view of the transport, a given place was a convenient centre from which to radiate into the country districts, picking up the population which would find for its requirements the most convenient place for education in that centre. Until that was done there would not be peace. While he differed from his right hon. friend as to the ideal position of the county as the area, he had the greatest doubt as to the policy of the Government—as to their policy as a whole. Year after year as these Bills went on, the area was not only growing larger and larger, but facilities were given for combining larger and larger areas, and in this Bill it was actually proposed that the Secretary for Scotland should permit two counties or districts to be combined for the purposes of education. But there was no power in the Bill to enable the Secretary for Scotland to permit an inconveniently large county, in regard to education, to be sub-divided into districts.

Mr. SCOTT DICKSON: Oh, yes, there is a power.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW said that the power was a conditional power, conditional on the districts so created being inside the county. The clientele of a secondary educational centre was drawn very often from six or seven counties and it could not possibly be said that a county area was suitable for a purpose of that kind. What was manifestly wanted was that a Boundary Commission should go down and investigate cases of the kind of Galashiels so as to ascertain whether they would produce an educational result, having in view the fact that localities must have local representation in an effective form, as to their requirements with regard to technical and secondary education. This might lead up to the formation of secondary and technical educational centres which would be convenient to the population affected. He expressed his obligation to the noble Lord for moving this Amendment as it brought before the attention of the Committee a question which was growing graver year by year. When these districts came to be investigated that question would be found still more strongly accentuated because some of the districts in point of view of population were absolutely contemptible, and at the other end of the scale they were so large as to be unworkable.

He did not desire to detain the Committee unduly upon this matter, but he must say he thought his hon. friend the Member for Kincardineshire had a good case for asking for an express clause in this Bill to deal with the circumstances to which he had referred. The point was brought out in an Amendment proposed by the late Lord-Advocate last year. The learned Lord then said he could agree that there might be cases where there should be combination for the purposes of secondary education, but not for the purposes of primary education, and, in admitting that, the learned Lord admitted the cardinal error of the present Bill, namely, the dislocation of the old school boards that had worked so well. As an illustration of what would be the effect of county centres he might say that a friend of his who was largely concerned in management had told him that, independent of other expenses, in railway fares alone his duties entailed upon him an expense of £50 a year. What were they going to do in the case of large counties like Inverness and Sutherland. In Inverness they had an area of 2,695,000 acres, and he put it to any hon. Member whether it would be possible to have a school board administering the educational affairs of these great counties without the parents of the children being completely disfranchised with regard to questions of education. There was no provision in this Bill for the payment of expenses even to those who could not afford the expense thrown upon them by their duties as members of these bodies. If the Government would give them that concession they might substitute small districts for small parishes. But instead of that they had an Amendment before the Committee to go back to counties and to make them the centre for education of all kinds.

MR. CALDWELL said he was not surprised that this Amendment should come from the other side of the House, because the main object of the Conservative Party was centralisation in connection with all local affairs. No reason had been assigned why a county should be chosen as the area. In Scotland education was almost entirely carried on in Board schools which were not confined to elementary education but which embraced secondary education as well. The object in Scotland had always been to carry on secondary and elementary education under the one authority, as it was carried on in the thousand parishes in Scotland. There were in Scotland three divisions of education. There were the State-aided schools which gave both primary and secondary education, the secondary schools proper with a curriculum of their own, and the Universities, and there must be a separate class of people to manage each different class of school. For the sake of these 20,000 children in purely secondary and technical schools were they going to change the body which governed the education of 700,000 children? It had been suggested that the county area was the better one for secondary education, but how could that possibly be so? They had an example of the difficulty in the case of Glasgow and the counties round about. There they had Renfrewshire, Lanarkshire, Dumbartonshire, and Stirlingshire all surrounding Glasgow. They wanted secondary education and high-class technical schools, but how could they limit the district for a high-class technical school? If they were to introduce such a school in each of those counties they would destroy the very object and power of such a school, for, after all, high-class technical education was not to be limited by locality. A high-class school was like a University, it should draw its pupils from all the centres round about.

He had been inquiring into the working of education boards in English counties, and he had found that there was a great deal of dissatisfaction with the wideness of the area and with its consequent unworkability. He had in his hands a magazine in which the writer of an article described the working of the system, and one of the first things he pointed out was that none but men of leisure could afford to become members of the education committee of the county council, the expenses being so heavy. One of the previous speakers had cited a case in which the annual expense of attending the meetings of the educational authority had amounted to £50, and according to this article he found that it was frequently the case that such expenses amounted to £30 per year. Another objection was that under that system a great deal of the work fell practically into the hands of the officials. No doubt members of the county council took an interest in matters which specially affected the district they represented, but when it came to dealing with the affairs of the county as a whole, and with matters affecting other districts, they really took little interest in them. Consequently, there was a system of wirepulling, and he ventured to think that the hon. Member for Renfrewshire was well aware of the existence of that practice.

SIR CHARLES RENSHAW: I deny it.

MR. CALDWELL said that apparently the hon. Member was not sufficiently on the alert to see it, but at any rate that had proved to be the experience in England. It was clear that the system afforded more scope for the wire-puller than would be possible in a smaller district. He trusted hon. Members would not think that he had for a moment any intention to slander county councils in Scotland. He was only referring to matters as they existed in the East of England. But still there was a danger that these practices might extend to Scotland. Then, again, in England they found the effect to be that more and more power was falling into the hands of the officials. What happened was that the official had more technical knowledge of the details of the policy which had to be carried out, and consequently he was allowed to have his own way, which would not be the case where the area was smaller. Again, in a large area they practically had the monopoly of the education of the whole district in the hands of one body, and while possibly in that large area there was one borough which had special aspiration in regard to educational matters which a view to being able to fit itself to compete with the industries of surrounding districts, the remainder of the area might probably be purely country, possessing county interests, and the result might be that the representatives of those county interests would dominate the educational policy, which would have no sympathy whatever with the borough aspirations. Consequently the representatives of the borough would fail to have an interest in the proceedings of the educational authority. In England, too, it had been found that under this system of wide areas there had been a slackness of administration.

There were likely also to be produced considerable difficulties arising from the variation in the size of the county areas. For instance, there was the county of Buteshire with its population of 18,641, just 141 more than sufficient to save them from the effect of the new redistribution proposed. Let them compare that with the county of Lanark with its enormous population. How could they expect one education authority to cover that vast county? It might be all right in the case of a borough like Glasgow to have one educational authority, which no doubt could satisfactorily manage the educational interests. But it was altogether different when they had to deal with a vast area like the county of Lanark, and undoubtedly one effect of having such a wide area would be to prevent men taking a keen interest in educational matters or accepting positions on the education authority, unless they happened to live in the particular town in which that authority had its headquarters, and they would thus deprive them of the power they desired to exercise in controlling the education of their country. The district area was bad enough, but the county area would make things absolutely unworkable, and entirely destroy that local interest in education which marked the great difference between the educational systems of England and Scotland.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) thought it was right to point out that not a single Member on the Ministerial side of the House had supported the Lord-Advocate in regard to the Amendment under discussion. There was a strong feeling among his own constituents that it would be a thousand pities to do away with the existing school boards so far as elementary education was concerned. No doubt as regarded technical and secondary education they might have larger areas, but so far as primary education was concerned they could have no better area than the present. He hoped they should get the Bill modified in that respect, so that local interest in education might be maintained.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY said he thought he might be allowed to explain his position. In his previous speech, when moving the Amendment, it seemed that he had not made it quite clear that he wanted to have the county education authority elected *ad hoc* the authority for secondary education. In a later part of the Bill he proposed to move a new clause which would give the parish council great power as regarded elementary education. Therefore he proposed to preserve the local interest in elementary education in the different parishes.

Mr. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said he intervened in the debate for the purpose of stating what his own experience had been. It had been found by practical experience that the areas in England were much too large. Before the county councils could get to work, local committees had to be appointed for each district, and in connection with one county council there were fifteen or sixteen local committees. County councils were therefore considering the question whether steps should be taken in order to lessen the area.

Mr. HUNTER CRAIG (Lanarkshire, Govan) said he would deplore the demolition of the Scottish school boards and the acceptance of the county area. He had had twelve years experience as chairman of a school board in the North of Ayrshire, which drew its pupils not only from two parishes, but from two counties, and the effect of making the county the school board area would be to cut off from it one-half of its pupils. If the framers of the Bill had acted on the basis of populous areas the measure would have been a much more practical one. There would be great inconvenience and expense to members of new school boards in the attending of meetings held many miles away from their localities. It might be well to have a county area for secondary education, but certainly not for elementary education. The life of education in Scotland had been that they had local schools locally managed. Without respect to the county area let them take the nearest and most convenient place for secondary education. According to this Bill scholars would have to be sent to Ayrshire secondary schools from the district of which he was speaking, whereas if there was the opportunity of sending them into Renfrewshire, scholars would have the advantage of a railway system which would take them to Greenock, where they could attend the secondary schools. He hoped something would yet be done to preserve these valuable school boards.

Mr. DOBBIE (Ayr Burghs) urged that the Amendment should be withdrawn. At this rate they could make no progress with the Bill. A very slight Amendment to the next sub-section would meet all the difficulties which had been put forward. He intended to support the Government, in the hope that after disposing of this Amendment they might make some headway with the Bill.

Mr. BLACK said it was a very extraordinary thing that not one Member on the Government side had supported the proposal of the Government. The Amendment was associated with the proviso in the clause, which was in the following terms—

> "Provided that on a representation received not later than October 25th, 1905, from a county council, or from a town council, or from an existing school board, and from time to time after the commencement of this Act on a representation from a county council, or from a town council, or from a school board, the Secretary for Scotland may, by order, determine that any two counties or that any two or more local government districts, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be combined into one education district, or that any county not divided into local government districts, or any local government district, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be divided into education districts, and such education districts shall be specified in the order; and a school board shall be established for each of the education districts so specified.

Here they had a provision under which unsuitable counties could be sub-divided, and that was why he supported the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 148; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 282)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Arrol, Sir William
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt HnGeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R.(Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick Geo.
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles,Lt-Col.H.F.(Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn

Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Bull, William James
Buxton,N.E (York,NR,Whitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell, Rt Hn. JA(Glasgow)
Campbell, J.HM(Dublin Univ.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Chamberlain, Rt HnJ.A(Worc.
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, M. Vaughan(Cardigan
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duke, Henry Edward
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Egerton, Hn. A. de Tatton
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt EC(SAndrw'sB'ghs
Elliot, Hn. A. Ralph Douglas
Evans, Samuel T (Glamorgan)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, NE.)
Finlay, Rt HnSir RB(Inv'rn'ss
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.Herbert J.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Graham, Henry Robert
Grant, Corrie
Grenfell, William Henry
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Heaton, John Henniker
Higham, John Sharp
Hozier, Hn.James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Lamont, Norman
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Crae, George
M'Iver, SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
Maxwell, Rt.HnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Milner, Rt Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway,N.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Reid, Sir, R Threshie(Dumfries
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie,Rt.Hon.Chas.Thomson
Robinson, Brooke
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford John (Lancashire)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, RtHnJ.Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomkinson, James
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col.Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H.(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Mr. Henry Forster.

NOES.

Baker, Joseph Allen
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Cameron, Robert
Dalkeith, Earl of
Duncan, J. Hastings
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall
Leese, Sir JosephF.(Accrington
M'Kenna, Reginald
Maxwell, W. H (Dumfriesshire
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Parrott, William
Philipps, John Wynford
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Russell, T. W.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, JA(Glamorgan,Gower
Ure, Alexander
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Lord Willoughby de Eresby
and Mr Black.

MR. CALDWELL moved an Amendment, the effect of which was to maintain the existing state of things under which every burgh and parish had its own school board. He said the Amendment raised one of the most important points in connection with the whole Bill. It dealt with the education authority to be set up under the Bill. The effect of the clause, if passed as drafted, would be to abolish about 1,000 school boards. Upwards of 900 of these were parish school boards, and fifty-seven were burgh school boards. Obviously a change of that kind would require something very strong so justify it. He had always advocated the old parochial school system of Scotland. He admired it in many respects as having been at the root of the success of Scottish education. In that respect Scotland differed in educational matters from any other country. If he felt strongly in the matter of preserving the parish area in Scotland as the unit for educational administration, it was because he had the idea that in that area, and that alone, education could be successfully conducted.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) called attention to the fact that there were not forty Members present.

House counted, and forty Members being found present.

Mr. CALDWELL said he wished to refer to the way in which this Bill affected the constituency of Mid-Lanark, which he represented. That constituency would be affected by the Bill in a manner more prejudicially than any other constituency in Scotland. The Middle Ward of Lanark had a population of 322,000 at the present moment, and it had nineteen school boards. All these school boards had been carrying on very great work both in elementary and secondary education. If this Amendment were defeated these school boards would be entirely abolished, and in their place there would be set up only one school board for the whole of that ward. The ward had not only a large population, but very large territorial area. It extended from Airdrie to Shotts, and the suggestion of the Bill was that these nineteen school boards, against which not a single word had been said, should be abolished. Whatever argument might be used for abolishing these boards, inefficiency would not be urged against them. In the case of Buteshire, which had a population of about 18,641, there were to be three school boards, and one of these would be for the Island of Cumbræ with a population of about 1,800. Could anyone conceive a more nonsensical system than that which they were asked to adopt? When the principle of the Bill was applied it worked out by giving one school board for 1,800 inhabitants in Cumbræ, and only one school board for 322,000 inhabitants in the populous and industrial centre of the Middle Ward of Lanark.

He was curious to know what were the grounds upon which the Lord-Advocate could justify a change of that kind. There were no school boards in the whole kingdom—he did not take Scotland alone, but in this connection he included England—which had done their work more efficiently than the boards in the Middle Ward of Lanarkshire. He instanced Motherwell, which had a first-class secondary school, where in the past work had been carried on successfully. Wishaw had one of the most important secondary and technical schools in the whole of Scotland, and it was doing a great deal of good work suited to the particular industry which was carried on in the district, namely, coal and iron mining. At Larkhall there was another secondary school, and he would like to know what the Lord-Advocate had got to say against the school board of Larkhall. Had the Education Department got a single bad report in regard to the secondary education given in that school? At Blantyre the school board had not limited itself to elementary education, secondary education was given at that place of a pretty high order. At Cambuslang, where the population consisted of the overflow of the middle class of Glasgow, people who lived in villadom, and where also there was an industrial population connected with the locality, the deepest interest was taken in the school work both in respect of elementary and secondary education. It had one of the best secondary schools in the kingdom, and the ve y best teachers were engaged to carry on the work. In regard to Hamilton, Airdrie, Coatbridge, and other places the same thing could be said. It was proposed by this Bill, which had been brought in without any justification, to dispossess these places of their school boards, and to put the whole area under one school board. The effect would be that the new school board would require a home somewhere. Probably it would be at Airdrie as perhaps the most populous place in the district. If the board had not its headquarters at Airdrie, Glasgow might be chosen. The result of that would be that the education affairs of the different parishes would be managed by representatives sent to that board who would not have the same local interest as was possessed at present by the members of the existing school boards. Wishaw, which had at present the full management of its own educational affairs, would have one representative on the new board. Who was to manage the schools which were now managed by the present school boards? They would be managed by persons outside the district. Who were the parties who had been in favour of this change? The Lord-Advocate very likely would say that Scottish opinion was unanimously in favour of the Bill.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: The hon. Member for Mid Lanark is not.

MR. CALDWELL said that was to say that with that exception Scottish opinion was in favour of the Bill. He ventured to say from communications he had received that that was not correct. The Lord-Advocate received deputations from one quarter in favour of the Bill, and they knew very well where those deputations came from. He remembered when Lord Balfour of Burleigh wished to introduce an Education Bill for Scotland, he invited information and suggestions from all parties as to what should be put in the Bill. He never knew of anything more ridiculous, because when dealing with an Education Bill the framer ought himself to be able to deal with it on his own authority. If information was asked here and there they would get a hotch-potch Bill.

Teachers were in favour of the wider area proposed by this Bill. They would have liked the county area, but the Government had gone between that and the parish area and had proposed the district area of the county. The Secondary School Teachers' Association and the large burghs in Scotland were the only parties so far as he could discover who were pressing this Bill forward. So far as he could gather, outside of the Teachers' Union, the people of Scotland were in favour of letting things be as they were. There was the strongest possible argument for that. The parish area was to be the area for taxation under the Bill. The school buildings were to be separately charged to the parish area. It was said in the case of England that there was an anomaly about school boards because they were not rating bodies and that they only issued a precept to the rating bodies. It was said that that was an anachronism, and yet in Scotland the county councils were to be the rating authority for education. If they looked into the history of the parish area in Scotland, they had to go back a very long time. They had to go back to 1696. In Scotland the parish was not only the area for education, but for the Church, and the management of the poor. The parish was the area for everything relating to the social life and condition of the people, and it had continued so down to the present moment, when the Government sought to abolish that area.

The Committee had not yet had any reason assigned why the change should be made. The Education Act of 1872 made education compulsory, and school boards were appointed in every borough and parish in Scotland. The ratepayers in the different parishes had the opportunity of electing the school boards, and in that way they had the full management of their own parish education. They were now, under the proposal in the Bill, to have only one vote in the management of their own school, and other people were to have a share in the management, although the school might be one in the management of which they were not concerned. At the present moment working men were able to become members of the school board, and a great deal of educational work was done by that class. Men in the rank of life of the hon. Member for Woolwich, the hon. Member for Durham, and the hon. Member for Battersea would have no possible chance of being on the new school board. In the parish area such men could attend board meetings, but in the larger area they would not be able to attend the board. A system which divorced the working classes not merely from having the full management of their parish school, but also divorced the great mass of the working classes from sitting on the school boards, was something for which the Committee wanted more justification than had yet been offered.

Another reason why it was desirable to have the school board in the particular parish was that the school attendance committee had to consider questions as to whether certain children should be exempted from attending school. How would that be dealt with under the Bill? Of course they could not have the school boards sitting in a particular locality hearing cases and deciding whether they would grant exemptions or not. It was an important matter to have men in the locality who knew the condition of the people, and who were able to decide in such cases from their own knowledge. In future, under the Bill, there would be managers composed of people outside the district altogether sitting in judgment on these cases. The majority of them would have no local knowledge, and perhaps no sympathy for the people. The Bill recognised that the district councils could not possibly perform the work themselves, and that there must be delegation. At present school boards had the power of delegating a portion of their work to managers, but practically no managers had been appointed, as boards preferred to do the work themselves. In the Bill proposed last year two-thirds of the managers in the case of a borough were to be elected by the town council, and two-thirds in the case of a parish were to be elected by the parish council or landward committee. Even that concession was taken away in the present Bill. Why was it taken away? The Lord-Advocate knew very well that it was taken away because the teachers did not want local control. The Bill now left even the appointment of managers in the hands of the school board, which would be composed to the extent of nine-tenths of aliens, so far as the parish was concerned.

The intention of the policy proposed to be carried out was to centralise the control of education. The reason why the parish system was to be abolished and the larger area adopted—a proposal which was being supported by the teachers alone—was that the teachers hoped to get larger salaries because there would be more lavish expenditure with the wider area. They also considered that they would have a larger field for promotion. His own view was that instead of there being a larger there would be a smaller field for promotion. If a vacancy occured in a school at Wishaw or Larkhall at the present moment the school board of the particular parish interested would consider how it was to be filled up, and if they wanted a superior teacher they would have no difficulty in giving an increased salary to the man they wanted. But if Wishaw or Larkhall only formed part of a wider area a teacher would get promotion from another school in that area, though he might not be a man of the superior class whose services the board could at present command. It was obvious that educational progress would be more likely if they had one district competing against another for teachers than if the appointments were in the hands of one board acting for a wide area. A district of a county which might be quite suitable as an administrative unit in connection with such questions as cattle disease and the maintenance of roads might not be a suitable area for education purposes. Education had to deal with population alone, and the administrative area should not be one which had no relation to the population of the locality.

He had not heard an argument based on educational considerations in favour of the proposed change. It had not been shown why for the sake of 20,000 children attending the secondary schools the school board areas were to be changed for 800,000 children in the elementary schools. As a rule working men took more interest in the education given in the schools than in the particular rate imposed for education. The amount of the assessment might be a very small matter on a £5 rent, but it was of great importance that the education given should be of the best quality. If the area under the administration of a board was so large that its members were not in the same degree representative of the different localities as the members of smaller boards, the popular interest in education might be diminished, and the electors might be swayed more by the amount of the rate than the promotion of education.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, to leave out from the word 'each,' to the end of line 24, and insert the words 'parish and burgh in Scotland.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. EUGENE WASON said he was anxious to know what the Lord-Advocate would say in reply to the powerful speech of his hon. friend the Member for Mid Lanark. It appeared to him that, so far as anomalies were concerned, the proposals brought forward by the President of the Local Government Board for the redistribution of seats were not so great as the anomalies contained in this Bill. It seemed to him to be absolutely preposterous that there should be a school board for Cumbrae with a population of 1,800, and only one school board for Mid Lanark with a population of 322,000. He reminded the Committee that some of the parishes in Scotland were very large. The parish in which he was born was twenty miles long by eight miles broad. He considered that was sufficiently large for an education area. Although the people of Scotland wanted an Education Bill passed, he did not think they wanted this special Bill. He would like to see the parish retained as the unit for elementary education. If that could be done, and if there was a power of amalgamation for secondary and technical education, then, and then only, would they get a Bill acceptable to Scotland. He was most anxious to see the Bill passed, but he really was at a loss to know what the Lord-Advocate would be able to say in reply to the indictment of the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON said he had difficulty in understanding the position taken up by the hon. Member for Clackmannan, who said that the people of Scotland desired an Education Bill, but did not desire this Education Bill, and then concluded by remarking that he desired to se this Bill passed.

MR. EUGENE WASON: With Amendments.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON said he had correctly represented what the hon. Member stated. He asked the Committee to consider what the position was. Of course, the Amendment struck at the very root of the Bill, and, if it were carried, the Bill necessarily went.

MR. CALDWELL. Hear, hear!

MR. SCOTT DICKSON said the hon. Member who proposed the Amendment evidently recognised that that was so. Yet he was a party to allowing the Second Reading to pass without a division—which was to say that he was satisfied with the principle of the Bill.

MR. CALDWELL: No, no! The Lord-Advocate would not suppose that I would call a division of my own Motion. I reserved my objections till the Committee stage.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON said that his objection was that this Amendment struck at the principle of the Bill. More than that, this was practically the same Amendment which the hon. Member proposed last year, and which received so little support that he did not challenge a division.

MR. CALDWELL: Since last year public opinion in Scotland has got more developed, and it is now very much stronger against the abolition of the parish areas.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON said that he had had a fair amount of opportunity of ascertaining what public opinion in Scotland was, and, so far as he could judge, there was an overwhelming majority in favour of the Bill as it stood, even without amendment, rather than lose it. Last year, when the same Amendment was proposed, the hon. and learned Member for the Border Burghs said he was bound to accept the proposal of the Bill in favour of districts on the assumption that some provision would be made for sub-dividing districts in the case of huge extents of territory or large masses of population. That assumption had been given effect to by the proviso introduced into the Bill. Therefore, the hon. and learned Gentleman stood bound to oppose the Amendment and to support the proposal of the Bill. The hon. Member for Mid Lanark assented to the statement that the Amendment would strike at the principle of the Bill, and that he would defend the small parish areas as suitable for the educational needs of the country.

Mr. EUGENE WASON: I do.

Mr. HUNTER CRAIG: As confined to elementary education—Yes.

Mr. SCOTT DICKSON: Who is there among us who will say that you are to separate elementary and secondary education?

Mr. CALDWELL: When did you discover that the present system was so inefficient? We never heard any dissatisfaction until the Bill was brought in last year.

Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said the position of the Government was not one of complaint against the existing school boards, which had ably discharged their duties, but they recognised that the situation had changed, and that the time had come when they must adapt their educational system to the needs of the country. Hon. Members opposite could not even agree among themselves. [Opposition cries of "Oh."] There was no vice in that surely. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen had interposed in the debate, and the hon. and learned Member for the Border Burghs afterwards got up to controvert the views of his right hon. friend. That was a distinct instance of want of agreement between two eminent Members for Scotland in regard to an educational policy for Scotland. He had understood that there was a general agreement amongst all educationalists that secondary and elementary education should be placed under the same control. He had also understood that there was a general agreement that the smaller area should no longer manage the educational interests in all their branches and they must have a large area. He agreed that the local government district was open to comment. It had never been said that it was perfect, but it had been put forward as the best area they could get. Large powers had been given to provide for aggregation or distribution in areas which required it. The result of the Bill would be that the districts proposed would be an immense improvement upon the existing parish areas so far as the management and conduct of their educational work was concerned. No reason had been advanced for departing from the position taken up last year. On the contrary, public opinion in Scotland was immensely in favour of the Bill, and there would be very great dissatisfaction if a Bill, which the vast majority of those interested in education in Scotland believed to be a long way in advance of anything that now existed or had heretofore been proposed, was endangered or lost by reason of the discussions in this House. [Opposition cries of "Oh."] He was sure he had not said anything that was discourteous, or that could be taken exception to. He was quite satisfied that public opinion in Scotland wished this Bill, and that it would be greatly dissatisfied if it were not passed.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Why, you have put down a whole lot of Amendments yourselves.

Mr. BLACK: Do you tell us this is not a proper place to discuss the Bill?

Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said that the country would judge. All he submitted to the Committee was that the arguments which the hon. Member had submitted in favour of this proposal—the same as those he submitted last year—should be treated as they were then treated, and that the House should agree with the Government that the proposals in the Bill were better calculated to advance the interests of Scotch education, and to effect a great improvement on what existed at the present time.

Sir ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said that the Lord-Advocate had directed quite a small part of his speech to the particular Amendment before the House. For his part he was not opposed to the views of the Lord-Advocate; and he agreed that it would be preferable to accept the Government proposals rather than to sacrifice the Bill; if, indeed, the passage of the Bill depended upon that acceptation. A good many of the Scottish Members had exercised considerable self-restraint during the discussion and desired to do nothing that would prevent the Bill from passing. Last year the Bill might have been passed into law had a little more time been given to it by the Government. Everybody knew that; but, no, it was relegated to the dog days, and they were told that unless they despatched the Amendments in a few hours instead of days, the Bill could not pass. This year they had come to the even more sorry spectacle of the House being engaged on a Bill, the Second Reading of which had been passed without a division, but to which the Government had not the slightest intention of giving sufficient time to enable it to pass.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the hon. and learned Member's remarks were rather wide of the discussion of the Amendment.

SIR ROBERT REID said he would not pursue that subject further beyond saying that the Government had only given four hours that afternoon for the purpose of considering what the Lord-Advocate had himself admitted to be an enormous and very serious question. All he could say was that the Government had no intention or idea of passing this Bill; and that they did not think it necessary or worth while to give proper time for the discussion of Scotch business. What they had said before and would say again in Scotland was that the business of Scotland was treated with contempt by the Government that was now in power.

*MR. AINSWORTH said he was inclined to suggest an Amendment by which the parish should be acknowledged as the unit, but that the Secretary for Scotland should have the power, if he thought fit, to combine for educational purposes, more than one parish or burgh. He thought it would meet the views of all parties.

MR. DALZIEL said that like many of his hon. friends he had refrained from taking part in the debate with the view of preventing the Government trying to place the responsibility of the non-passage of this Bill on the shoulders of the Opposition. He was surprised that the Lord-Advocate, who was usually so conciliatory, should have levelled a totally unfounded charge against the Opposition. That charge was that if this Bill was not allowed to pass it would be on account of prolonged discussion. Did the Lord-Advocate mean to suggest that this Bill, affecting the whole of Scotland, was to pass without any discussion at all? Did the right hon. Gentleman suggest that there had been any undue discussion? It was not fair on the part of the Government, when they brought forward a Bill of the greatest importance to Scotland, that they should take shelter from their own delinquincies and place the blame on the shoulders of the Opposition. If the Government had thought anything of this Bill they would have brought it forward and had it discussed earlier in the session. The fact was that it was the Eton and Harrow cricket match that day which was responsible, he supposed, for the Bill having been put down at all. Yet he believed there was a general desire that the Bill should pass with proper Amendments, and in passing it the Lord-Advocate would have the hearty co-operation of many Members on that side of the House. He would rather see the Bill openly and promptly sacrificed than——

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member must come to the Amendment.

MR. DALZIEL said it was only a question of time. He confessed he had been led away by the most discursive and argumentative speech of the Lord Advocate on the general point. The question was whether they ought not to retain the parish area as the unit in connection with elementary education. He confessed he had listened with astonishment to the indictment which the

Lord-Advocate had made as to the working of the present system. The Lord-Advocate had said that the present system had been a complete and absolute failure, and that the whole of Scotland recognised it. Now, that was a totally unwarranted statement.

Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said that that was not a statement made by him.

Mr. DALZIEL said that, then, he did not know what the Lord-Advocate meant. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that the parish authority had not been a success, and that therefore these increased powers ought to be given. He contended that there was no person in authority in Scotland who would dare go before any representative public meeting and condemn the way in which the work of education had been carried on by the parish school boards. It was the proudest boast of Scotland that boys had been sent out from the parish school board schools and had taken distinguished places in every part of the world; and, therefore, he had heard with surprise and indignation the reflections which the Lord-Advocate had made on the present school authorities. The question was whether they should have a larger area than the parish. It was true that in regard to particular parishes the local school board had fuller knowledge of the wants of the district than a board representing a larger area would possess. Then under the scheme of the Bill they would require to have as representatives on the board men of wealth and leisure. He acknowledged that for secondary education there was something to be said for having a larger area; but he insisted that for elementary education the areas should be kept exactly as they were.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW said that the inadequate opportunities for discussion on the Bill required no demonstration, and it was out of the question for the Lord-Advocate to deprecate discussion in this House on this most important question. As to differences of opinion among the Opposition, they would be in a sorry case if, on the Committee stage of a serious and important Bill, they might not exchange ideas in regard to the best lines of educational development for their country. He did not think that the Lord-Advocate quite appreciated the development of opinion in Scotland in regard to this question. He had already given one notable instance of that which ought to have been taken into account viz., the opinions expressed by the Forfarshire school boards. He quite took it from his hon. and learned friend that there was no intention on his part to make derogatory remarks on existing school boards. One of the most valuable reports of the past year was that of the Port Glasgow School Board, one sentence of which was relevant to the Amendment before the Committee. It was to the effect that the provisions in the Bill for the extension of the area and the supersession of the existing school boards were such as practically to ignore the right of parents in each locality to have a direct voice in the management of the schools in the area. Another school board reported that the areas proposed in the Bill were too large, and, if carried into effect, would be the means of destroying to a large extent the local interest in the schools. Further, that school board declared that, if the proposed areas were agreed to, very few local gentlemen would have the means or the time to travel to the meetings of the board, and consequently the selection of the representatives would be limited to candidates of wealth and leisure. In the clause under discussion, he quite granted that the Government had gone some way to meet the argument presented, because amongst powers of aggregation there were also powers of division; but that power of division into education districts was only permissible on the sanction of Dover House. They did not desire to hand over that power to the gentlemen in Dover House, however eminent they might be. He believed that if the old parochial areas were retained for the purposes of elementary education, with power given to them to combine for secondary and technical education, even though they were supervised from Whitehall, it would be greatly to the interest of education in Scotland.

Sir MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire) said that he had had a large practical experience of school board work during the last thirty years, and he admitted that he would part company with the old system with much regret. A great deal more interest used to be taken in the management of education than now; but he concurred with the Lord-Advocate that the time had come when they should have a more extended sphere of educational management. He did not think that they would lose local interest if they parted with the old system. The schools were not to cease to exist, and the boards would practically remain the same as they were before. Although the managers would not be elected directly to that position, in all probability they would be taken from the members of the parish councils. He would rather have the Bill as a whole as it stood than lose the opportunity of passing a Bill at all. There were several points with which the existing school boards could not adequately deal; and it was not to be wondered at that the teachers came and asked Parliament to pass this Bill. Under existing conditions they were subject to very considerable hardships. If a good teacher was appointed to a rural school, he remained there to the end of his days; but the Bill proposed to deal quite impartially with the whole system of teaching in the county; and he thought the teachers would have a much greater chance of promotion under the proposed newly constituted authority than under the old system. Again, what could the present members of the school boards know of secondary education? He believed that 90 per cent. of the Scotch Members were willing that this Bill should pass, and he asked the Lord-Advocate to induce, in the course of the week, the Government to give a few more days to carry the Bill into law this session.

MR. DOBBIE said that the Lord-Advocate had perhaps minimised the feeling in Scotland upon the question under discussion. He had a report from the school board of Port Glasgow, a most important industrial centre in the West of Scotland, which stated that some of the features of this Bill were most objectionable, especially the provision for the extension of the areas, which practically ignored the right of parents in each locality to take part in the management of the schools. Undoubtedly public feeling in Scotland was developing on the lines indicated by the hon. Member for Mid.-Lanark. His own opinion, however, was that the larger area proposed by the Bill was an improvement, and he should therefore vote against the Amendment.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) said he regretted that the Lord-Advocate had introduced into this discussion a degree of animadversion which he thought the Committee had done nothing to justify. There was only one day's debate on the Second Reading of the Bill, and now they had only this short time given to begin with for the Committee stage. A supporter of the right hon. Gentleman had moved an Amendment which occupied one or two hours, finding many supporters on the Ministerial Benches, and because of that the Lord-Advocate told them that if the discussions were prolonged at the same length Scotland would be deprived of the advantages of this Bill. But, unfortunately, the House had a duty to perform in regard to this or any other Bill; he held that the edge of fair discussion had not yet been reached. In any case the Lord-Advocate's lecture was premature, as this was only the second day on the Bill. With regard to the Amendment he had to say that he thought it was a thousand pities that the Government ever contemplated interfering with the parish school boards of Scotland. No doubt, as they had slaughtered the school boards in England, they thought it would be inconsistent if, having to remodel Scottish education, they did not abolish the school boards in Scotland also. Local control had been the corner-stone of the education system in Scotland through all the generations of the past, even in the old days when the parish minister was the principal local authority; and he was enough of a democrat to believe that such local control was a most essential point in regard especially to primary education, which concerned the great mass of the people. They did not keep up the same control if they took the larger district of the county. Now the control would be left to the managers who were to be appointed and who would be only the agents of this higher authority. When the Lord-Advocate said that the whole of Scotland was waiting and gasping for this Bill to pass, he could tell him this—and he thought he could pit his knowledge of Scotland against that of the right hon. Gentleman—that so far as his knowledge of Scotland went, and also his conception of the genius and general sympathies of the Scottish people, he believed that nine-tenths of the people were opposed to the abolition of the parish school boards, however much they might approve of other parts of the Bill.

The people of Scotland were not all composed of schoolmasters who were, no doubt, in favour of it, or philosophers, dreamers, or doctrinaires, and all those who had had a hand in creating this ridiculous co-ordination system which had played havoc in many instances and respects with English education, and which he did not expect would do much good to Scotland. The Scotch were a plain people who wished their children to be properly educated in the parish schools, by the parish schoolmaster, up to the time they went to the University. This system of secondary and technical education might be wanted in some parts of Scotland, but if it was, why was it not possible to have it going on side by side with the old system with all its benefits. It was because this part of the Bill abolished the old parish connection that he should heartily support the Amendment of his hon. friend. It would be quite possible, of course, to enlarge certain areas, for some of the present areas were too small. He was, he believed, the only survivor in the House of those who took part in Lord Young's Act of 1872, and he remembered either moving or at least putting on the Paper an Amendment on this very point, that parishes should have the power of uniting under proper control for the purpose of efficient management. With that they got all the advantage they required, and that, of course, would be consistent with maintaining throughout the country the school boards which had done such splendid service in the past, and which were better than any fantastic alien body which they could erect in the vicinity of the parish to carry on the great work upon which the prosperity of their country had so largely depended in the past.

Mr. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) said he would like to have the opinion of the four right hon. Gentlemen opposite upon the speech which the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition had just made, as to whether they signified their desire to return to the old parish system.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I never said so.

Mr. PARKER SMITH said he certainly understood that the right hon. Gentleman regarded the large development of secondary schools as apparently superfluous and unnecessary.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, on the contrary, he said exactly the reverse. What he said was that he did not wish to destroy the old system which should, in his opinion, be carried on side by side with the new, which the changing conditions in Scotland made necessary.

Mr. PARKER SMITH accepted the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman, and said it appeared to him that the right hon. Gentleman had by his speech opened up a very large and bold question which he (Mr. Parker Smith) thought was settled years ago. Was that the spirit in which the Opposition were going to discuss this Bill? Was that the spirit in which, in the opinion of hon. Gentlemen opposite, the Scotch people expected it to be discussed? The question raised in the Bill was one of the most important questions that could be raised with regard to Scotland, but if all these points were to be regarded as open questions, and were all to be argued out from beginning to end, it was not one day but a whole session that would be required to force the passage of this Bill. It would, however, be clear to people here and in Scotland, and to all those strangers who took a great interest in the Bill——

MR. DALZIEL, on a point of order, asked whether, he having been called to order for referring to the general state of the Bill, the hon. Member now addressing the Committee was in order in taking the same course.

MR. PARKER SMITH asked whether it was not the fact that the question had been opened up by several speakers on the other side, and whether, that being so, he was not entitled to reply.

THE CHAIRMAN said an opening had been given by the Lord-Advocate in his speech, and that being so, he (the Deputy-Chairman) had allowed some latitude to one or two speakers. The debate had since continued on the same lines and he felt he could not rule it out of order on account of the Lord-Advocate having introduced it.

MR. DALZIEL asked whether the Committee was to understand from that ruling that this discursive debate was entirely due to the speech of the Lord-Advocate.

THE CHAIRMAN said he could not admit that. He only desired to convey to the Committee the reason why he had allowed some latitude.

MR. PARKER SMITH said he would not pursue the subject further. But having regard to the fact that the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite enjoyed a certain consideration in Scotland, he also desired to state his view in order that the people of Scotland might be perfectly able to judge on which side was the desire to pass the Bill into law.

MR. FINDLAY (Lanarkshire, N.E.) said he had had no special desire to intervene in the discussion, but after what had been said he felt constrained to show the Committee how this matter affected his own district. The school boards of the various parishes had done their work most efficiently, and he could not conceive that the work could be better done. He thought the proposed change would kill a great deal of the local interest, and he wished emphatically to say that he did not believe that the larger school board area would ensure the work being carried on more efficiently or more economically than it was being carried on by the present authorities in the parish areas in and round Motherwell.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) admitted that this was a very difficult question, and one upon which all people in Scotland did not think alike. The conclusion that he had come to was that, taking Scotland as a whole, the system of this Bill was the only system upon which education could be conducted. There might be some improvements made in the Bill, because he was satisfied that many people in Scotland held a very strong opinion with regard to parting with the old school boards, and he thought something might be done to ameliorate that. Speaking for himself, he was so anxious to get the new system introduced into Scotland, so conscious of the extent to which Scottish education was suffering from want of a new instrument, so much moved by appeals which reached him by every post to get the Bill through, that he would go a long way to take the Bill as it stood.

Mr. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said the hon. Member who had just sat down was so laudably anxious to spread secondary education in Scotland that he sometimes overlooked the real interests of elementary education. Had the Government, in dealing with the English Bill, confined themselves to the lines suggested by his right hon. friend below, they would not have tampered with elementary education in the way they had. It had not been proved that the larger areas had been a success. He ventured to say that all those actually interested in progressive education found the areas over which they had to preside altogether too large to enable them to keep in personal contact with the work, so that the Act had become an officials' Act, to be worked mainly by officials. The general interest which was taken in the parish schools in days gone by had disappeared owing to the treatment of the managers, who could not now order so much as a lead pencil without going to the education authority. He quite agreed that there were in Scotland, as there were in the past in England, very small parish school boards, and it would be better to join two or three together. But it was not necessary to destroy the parish school boards and the direct contact of the parents with them in order to do that. In England they had done their best to make secondary education an absolutely separate work, and they had not found that the principle of co-ordination could be carried out in the way in which it was first supposed it could be. He therefore felt satisfied, from his experience of the working of the Act in England, that, so far as Scotland was concerned, both on the ground of economy and of efficiency, it would have been far better to have enlarged the area of a few of the smaller school boards in Scotland, but to have maintained for the most part the parish unit intact.

Mr. BUCHANAN, referring to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Partick, pointed out that only yesterday morning forty new Amendments were put on the Paper in the name of the Lord-Advocate. In view of that fact, were they to be told that they were doing anything at all unfair in considering one of the most important Amendments that could possibly be discussed?

Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said the Amendments standing in his name were put down merely that hon. Members on both sides of the House might ascertain the Amendments he was prepared to accept.

Mr. BUCHANAN replied that that did not vitiate his point, which was that it was only yesterday that they got an idea of what the intentions of the Government were. There were yesterday morning 360 odd Amendments on the Paper. More than half of these stood in the name of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and a large number of them in the name of the right hon. Member for Partick himself. In these circumstances it was absurd to bring railing accusations against hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN thought the hon. Gentleman had better address himself to the Amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Partick had made a variety of charges against the Leader of the Opposition, and all he desired to point out was that there was another side to the question.

Mr. CALDWELL said his Amendment did not include the combination of parishes, and he was not moving the existing state of things. He was moving to take the parishes and burghs as the units.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 130; Noes, 67. (Division List No. 283.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. (Shropsh.)
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brymer, William Ernest
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J. A. (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crombie, John William
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartand, Sir Fred. Dixon
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elibank, Master of
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Rt Hn. Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss
Flower, Sir Ernest
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Howard, J. (Midd, Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt. Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Rt. Hn J Parker (Lanarks
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart

Tellers for the Ayes—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Henry Forster

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Black, Alexander William
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer William Randal
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Findlay, Alexander (LanarkNE
Fowler, Rt. Hon Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Higham, John Sharp
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kitson, Sir James
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall
Leese, Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt.Hn.John(Montrose
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway,N
Parrott, William
Philipps, John Wynford
Russell, T. W.
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire
Slack, John (Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas,J.A(Glamorgan,Gower
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Eugene Wason

MR. BLACK said the Amendment he moved was an attempt to safeguard the rights of parish councils in the event of an order by the Secretary for Scotland being contemplated for dividing or combining areas proposed in the Bill. If the Bill passed as it stood, the only authorities who would be allowed to make representations to the Secretary for Scotland were the county or the town council or the enlarged school board. He thought he would carry the Committee with him in suggesting that the parish council should be entitled to come forward to the Secretary for Scotland and say that in the interests of local control over education the district proposed by the Bill should be split up so as to preserve the local control which he was sure all desired. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 6, after the word 'board' to insert the words 'or from a parish council.'"—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SCOTT DICKSON said he hoped the Amendment would not be pressed. Until the Bill was passed the existing school board would be able to make representations, and after the Bill was passed the enlarged school board would be able to do so. Surely the interests of education would be sufficiently attended to by the representations which could be made either by the school board or by the county council.

MR. CALDWELL urged that the Amendment was necessary.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON said that the matter was not of great importance, and if the hon. Member wished to press the Amendment he had no objection.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. BLACK said the next Amendment standing in his name was intended to provide for the case of an order dividing or combining districts before the Act came into operation. As the Bill at present stood, if the Secretary for Scotland made a division or amalgamation he could do so without consulting anybody and without giving notice to anybody. His Amendment was to provide that before the change took place, and before a county or district was joined to or divided from another, due notice should be given to all parties interested. His Amendment also provided that any of the local authorities interested or any twenty ratepayers might appear before the Secretary for Scotland and plead their case for or against amalgamation or division. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 14, at the end to insert the words, 'Provided further that an order made under this section shall not come into force until one month after the same has been published in at least one newspayer circulating in the neighbourhood affected by the order during which period it shall be competent for any local authority or any twenty ratepayers within or bordering upon the area affected by such order to present a requisition for a hearing thereon, and on receiving such a requisition the Secretary for Scotland shall appoint a convenient time and place for hearing parties, and he shall then and there, either by himself or by a proper person as his depute, hear parties as to such order, and shall at his sole discretion or at the sole discretion of his depute receive evidence written or oral and shall determine in the matter as may seem just.'"—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

MR. CALDWELL said that under this proviso a most important change might be effected without any intimation to the people of the district concerned. Surely a proposal to reduce a county area into a district or parish area was a vital one and the inhabitants affected ought to have an opportunity of making representations before the Secretary for Scotland came to any decision on it. Would it be right to create a new school board district just before the Act came into operation, without hearing the parties vitally concerned? They were already trying to leave out certain adjuncts, such as Leith from Edinburgh and Govan from Glasgow, but of what use was it for them to do that if the Secretary for Scotland was to be able, by a stroke of the pen, to practically undo all that had been done or that was contained in the Bill! Why should not notice be given in the same way as when alterations were proposed under the Boundaries Act of 1891. In that case it was provided that the Secretary for Scotland should hold an inquiry and give complete notice in the *Edinburgh Gazette* and in the newspapers, so that every person having an interest should have an opportunity of being heard. Even if this proposal were carried the Secretary for Scotland would have the most absolute power to make any change he thought fit. The only effect of carrying the Amendment would be to ensure that persons affected would have an opportunity of being heard.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON said this matter had not been overlooked, but the question was whether time would allow of doing as suggested in the Amendment. Under Section 50 the first school board was to be elected on April 1st, 1906, and while he did not dispute the reasonableness of the hon. Member's proposal, he did doubt whether there would be time between the passing of the Act and the making of the necessary arrangements which would have to precede the election, to hold such an inquiry as was suggested. He was quite willing, however, to consider the point. He could not accept the Amendment now. It must be remembered that the Secretary for Scotland could not act on his own initiative; he had to be set in motion by representations from the county council or the school board or some other public body. Those bodies would necessarily take some time to consider whether representations should be made, and then the Secretary for Scotland would probably require to communicate with them before coming to a conclusion. Then a month would be required for advertising purposes, and more time must be allowed for the consideration of evidence either oral or written, and the matter would have to be further considered before the issue of a final deliverance which must be made before April, 1906, so as to enable proper arrangements to be made for an election at that date. If the hon. Member, however, would withdraw the Amendment he would undertake to reconsider the matter, although he could not pledge himself that that reconsideration would result in a favourable answer.

Mr. CALDWELL thought the suggestion a reasonable one, but pointed out that the cases in which the suggested inquiry would be necessary would probably be very few indeed.

Mr. BLACK: Under the circumstances I ask leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. BLACK said the object of his next Amendment was to ensure that when the Secretary for Scotland came to consider either now or at some future time the question of dividing a large area into small areas he should as far as possible have regard to the school board districts under the existing laws, or such aggregation thereof as might for educational purposes solely seem best. The object of introducing the word "solely" was to be found in the fact that the districts proposed in the Bill were admittedly in many cases entirely unsuitable for education, and when the right hon. Gentleman came to the task of dividing them it was only right and reasonable he should have special regard to educational convenience. If the right hon. Gentleman would accept this Amendment it would go far towards meeting the views of hon. Members on both sides of the House. It would also be desirable that the right hon. Gentleman should keep in view the securing of a convenient centre with good means of communication so that pupils living at home might be able to attend the school of the district to which they were attached. Further, regard should be had to the efficiency of the facilities provided in existing schools for purposes of both elementary and secondary education. To this proviso he attached much importance, and where schools were so conducted that they were unable to send their pupils direct to the University they should be made the centre of the district.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 14, at the end, to insert the words, 'provided further that in considering as to dividing a local government district into education districts under this section the Secretary for Scotland shall as far as possible preserve the school board districts under the heretofore existing law or such aggregations thereof as may for educational purposes solely seem best, keeping in view not only population and area but also means of communication with a convenient centre for secondary education and the efficiency of the facilities heretofore provided in the existing school board district for secondary as well as elementary education."—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said he could not accept the Amendment. Keeping in view the fact that the Secretary for Scotland was not to initiate proceedings it would be better that he should be left with a free hand. He did not suggest that the considerations mentioned in the Amendment should not be taken into account, and due weight no doubt would be given to them, but inserted as a statutory declaration they would unduly fetter the judgment of the Secretary for Scotland.

Mr. BLACK: I have put in the words "as far as possible."

Mr. SCOTT DICKSON: If a thing is not possible it cannot be done. I repeat that in my opinion it would be unwise to tie our hands in this manner, and I hope, therefore, that the Amendment will not be pressed.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW thought it would be extremely advantageous when they were providing for a combination of the areas, to give some statutory lead to the official responsible so as to guide him in making up his mind on the subject. He trusted that the Lord-Advocate would see his way to accept some form of words in this direction.

Mr. TENNANT (Berwickshire) said that those who lived in Scotland and took an active part in public affairs had good reason to realise the extreme difficulty of communication, having often to travel distances to attend meetings of public authorities which could not be conveniently completed in one day. This Amendment seemed harmless enough. It was only in the nature of a sign-post directing the administrator's path, and he did not agree that it would unduly tie the hands of the Government.

Mr. CALDWELL also appealed to the Lord-Advocate to accept the Amendment.

Mr. DALZIEL trusted the right hon. Gentleman would not put the Committee to the trouble of a division.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 69; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 284.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Austin, Sir John
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Dobbie, Joseph
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Eve, Harry Trelawne,
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark N.E
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Higham, John Sharp
Jones, David Brynmor (Swan se

Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John (Montrose
Parrott, William
Philipps, John Wynford
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Russell, T. W.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A. Glamorgan, Gower
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Black and Mr. Robert Wallace.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H
Bailey, James (Walworth
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon, Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elibank, Master of
Faber, George Denison (York)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Rt Hn Sir R B. (Inv'rn'ss
Flower, Sir Ernest
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Morrison, James Archibald
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Pease, Herbert Pike Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Rt Hn J Parker (Lanarks
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander-Acland Hood and Mr. Herny Forster.

And, it being after half-past Five of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 3

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 17th July, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills:—London Government Scheme (Hackney and Edmonton Unions); London Government Scheme (London and Middlesex); Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—London County Council (Tramways).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (Aberavon Tramways Order). The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Aberavon Tramways Order. Ordered, That the Order be not further proceeded with.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

South Barracas (Buenos Ayres) Gas and Coke Company Bill [H.L.]. Committee to meet to-morrow.

North Eastern Railway Bill; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Ellenborough be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Ravensworth; read, and agreed to.

Dover Harbour Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a (according to order).

Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill; Dublin United Tramways Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill. Read 3^a (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill. Read 3^a (according to order), with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill. Read 3^a (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 1) Bill. Third Reading (which stands appointed for this day) put off to Friday next.

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 72, 82, and 85 be suspended for the remainder of the session.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Gosport and Fareham Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [H.L.]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Andover Lighting and Power Bill; Great Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Edinburgh Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. (No. 141.) A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Edinburgh Corporation. And

Stonehaven Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. (No. 142.) A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Stonehaven Harbour. Were presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow; read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Section 7), deemed to have been read 2ª; and reported from the Committee.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 143.)

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 16) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 17) Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 16th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bills read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS) BILL.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, I desire to make an application to my noble friend the Chairman of Committees. I observe that to-morrow there is down for Second Reading the Bill promoted by the London County Council for bringing the tramways across the bridges and along the Embankment. This has always been a highly contentious question. There have been frequent discussions in both Houses of Parliament with regard to this particular Bill, and I would ask my noble friend whether he could see his way to postpone the Second Reading from to-morrow until, say, Thursday next. I understand there is a prospect of the rejection of the measure being proposed, and as it has only just come up to your Lordships' House and we have not really had an opportunity of considering it, I hope the noble Earl will agree to its postponement.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, I hope my noble friend will not press his desire that this Bill should be put off. This Bill has been before Parliament for a considerable time, and has been in your Lordships' House for five or six days; and, as noble Lords are aware, at this period of the session, when Bills of a contentious character come up from the other House, it is not always possible to secure the best material for Committees of your Lordships' House. I have arranged for the constitution of the Committee which is to consider this Bill, for I hope your Lordships will see your way to send it to a Select Committee, and unless that Committee gets to work at the earliest possible date, I fear it will be impossible for the noble Lords who have consented to serve upon it to take their places on the Committee. I therefore sincerely hope my noble friend will not press his desire that the Bill should be postponed. It is not in the public interest that the matter should be delayed any longer than is necessary..

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).

Further Papers regarding the administration of the Army in India (in continuation of [Cd. 2572]).

PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND).

Report to the Local Government Board for Scotland on the sanitary condition of the Island of Lewis.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3437. Turkey (Damascus).

No. 3438. Italy (Ancona).

No. 3439. Portugal (Lourenço Marques).

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES.

1. Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England and Wales (1904).

2. Supplement to Sixty-fifth Annual Report. Part I.

3. Supplement to Sixty-fifth Annual Report. Part II.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

WINTER ASSIZES ACT, 1876.

Seven Orders in Council of the 11th July, 1905, relating to the ensuing Winter Assizes.

COLONIAL PRISONERS REMOVAL ACT, 1884.

Order in Council of 11th July, 1905, applying the Colonial Prisoners Removal Act, 1884, to the East Africa Protectorate.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876, AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACTS.

Order in Council of 11th July, 1905, varying the Order in Council of 25th March, 1877, relating to day industrial schools.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Order in Council of 11th July, 1905, constituting Burntisland a port of registry for British sea-fishing boats.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).

The Marquess of RIPON: My Lords, I rise to ask the noble Marquess the Under-Secretary of State for India a Question of which I have given him private notice. I am anxious to learn whether any further arrangements have been arrived at in respect to the recent proposals for the reorganisation of Army administration in India; and, if so, whether the noble Marquess will state the nature of those proposals and lay Papers on the Table as soon as possible.

***The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (The Marquess of Bath)**: My Lords, the Viceroy has communicated to the Secretary of State by telegraph certain points in connection with the despatch of May 31st on Army administration, on which the Government of India think it necessary to make representations, in order, as they submit, to render the working of the new scheme practicable. The Secretary of State has explained in return that these recommendations do not contravene the provisions of the despatch and he has expressed the satisfaction of His Majesty's Government that Lord Kitchener is now in accord with the Viceroy and his Council as to the course to be adopted with regard to them. The points on which the Viceroy requested assurances were as follows. First, that the member of Council in charge of the Military Supply Department should always be a soldier. His Majesty's Government are prepared to appoint a solider to the impending vacancy, but they cannot fetter the discretion of the Crown as to future vacancies. Secondly, that the Military Supply Member should be available for official consultations by the Viceroy on all military questions without distinction. The reply of His Majesty's Government is that there is no desire to fetter the constitutional right of the Viceroy to consult any member of his Council officially or unofficially on any subject, but that the existing system, by which all the Commander-in-Chief's proposals pass to the Viceroy through the channel of the Military Member having been done away with, it follows that no special claim can exist for the Military Supply Member to be consulted or note on the proposals of the Commander-in-Chief or *vice versâ*. Thirdly, he asked that the Secretary to the Government of India in the Army Department (to be in future presided over by the Commander-in-Chief) should be given the local rank of major-general. To this there is no objection. Fourthly, that important changes in military organisation, especially in the native Army, should be discussed by a Mobilisation Committee, of which the Commander-in-Chief and Millitary Supply Member should be essential members, and that a schedule of cases should be drawn up which the Secretary in the Army Department should submit to the Viceroy before orders are passed on them. These provisions are entirely in accord with the despatch; and His Majesty's Government are glad to find that on this, as on the preceding points, they can meet the views of the Government of India without affecting the principle of the new system which it has been deemed necessary to establish. The telegrams to which I have alluded have, I believe, already been laid on the Table, and will very shortly, I trust, be in the possession of your Lordships.

THE ADMIRALTY AND STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

*LORD BRASSEY rose, "To call attention to the Report of the Select Committee on Steamship Subsidies and to the Reserves of the Navy in ships and in men." The noble Lord said: My Lords, all will regret the absence of Lord Cawdor when Admiralty matters are under discussion. The wish is universal for his early restoration to perfect health. In introducing the subject to which I desire to call attention, it is not necessary to insist on its importance. "Frigates, more frigates!" was the cry of Lord Nelson. In giving evidence before the Committee on Subsidies, Lord Charles Beresford said that success or defeat in the initial stages of a war might turn on speedy information and the maintenance of long lines of communication. Where shall we obtain at the least cost the most efficient vessels? Lord Charles Beresford told the Committee that no ships could do the duty of scouts better than the ocean greyhounds of the mercantile marine, built for speed in any weather.

Can the mercantile marine, unaided by the State, supply the ships we require? In the ocean carrying trade British shipowners more than hold their own. Our share is steadily increasing in the entrances and clearances at British and foreign ports, and notably in the traffic through the Suez Canal. In first-class ships—the pride and glory of a maritime nation—we are falling behind. Taking vessels of 4,000 tons and upwards, our British tonnage has increased in five years from 211,000 tons to 975,000 tons, while German tonnage has gone up from 480,000 tons to 1,230,000 tons. Of the nine ships built since 1895 exceeding 10,000 tons displacement and twenty knots speed, one only, the "Oceanic," of the White Star Line, is under the British flag. We are third on the list of speedy vessels, and we should be first.

The explanation is not far to seek. The trade of the North Atlantic is the only trade in which the fast vessels required for the Navy can be run without loss; and foreign shipowners have advantages not shared by their British competitors. The ocean services of Germany have an advantage in the geographical position of Bremen and Hamburg, in communication by railway, by canals, and canalised rivers, with all the industrial centres. In the port of Hamburg the largest barges and the largest ocean steamships lie side by side. German ocean shipping is concentrated in two powerful combines, under able management, aided and assisted in every way by the Government. They are practically a department of the State. The Hamburg-American Company is continually growing by the absorption of smaller companies. The process is extending to services under the Austrian, Danish, and Italian flags, as well as under that of Germany. The Atlantic services under the flag of the United States, though not directly aided by the Government, have the powerful support of the great railway companies. The French ocean steamships are liberally subsidised.

When the Atlantic combine was formed His Majesty's Government took steps to secure that a service should be maintained under the British flag and under British management. They desired that the ships should be second to none. These considerations led to the agreement with the Cunard Company. The policy of the Government has commanded general approval. From a naval point of view we have not gone far enough as regards numbers; we have been perhaps too exacting as to speed. It is not necessary to dwell on the objections to subsidies paid for the encouragement of trade. The failure of that enervating system is conspicuous wherever it has been tried. It has been well that our shipowners have had to depend on their own unaided efforts and the skilful management of their business. When we come to deal with the requirements of the public service other considerations must be brought into view. Under existing conditions, without subsidies we shall not obtain from the British mercantile marine the vessels of exceptional speed required for the Navy.

If subsidies are given, in what service shall the ships be employed? A fast direct mail service has long been desired in Canada. The Government has made offers. The commercial community would wish that they should be more liberal. Senator Sir George Drummond appeared in their name before the Committee on Subsidies. He believed that an annual subsidy of £400,000 would be required to open a line. In a short time it would become self-supporting. He hoped for a contribution from the mother country in aid of an enterprise which would open up Canada and greatly promote the Imperial work of closer union. In the same year in which the Committee on Subsidies reported, a congress of chambers of commerce met at Montreal. It was attended by hundreds of delegates from all parts of the Empire. After full debate the following resolution was unanimously passed—

> "This Congress considers it of the utmost importance, in the interests of the Empire, that the United Kingdom and her Colonies should adopt a policy under which lines of steamships will be secured and retained, (1) for fast mail services on the several routes; (2) for the development of trade between the mother country and her possessions, and between the Colonies themselves."

Coming from a representative body that resolution should have weight with your Lordships. At a time when, without distinction of Party, we are seeking by every practical means to strengthen Imperial unity, a fast service to Canada should merit consideration.

Lord Charles Beresford proposed an alternative to the payment of subsidies. He suggested that the Government might pay the expense of building ships, and might hand them over to one of the great companies to be worked for profit. The ships might yield a fair return on their cost. A share of the profits might be paid to the Government. Being constantly at sea, the ships would at all times be absolutely fit for service. If such a plan were considered feasible, an opportunity now offers which may never recur. The Admiralty have at their disposal numerous cruisers, protected but not armoured, as to the retention of which in the Navy list the Board has been in doubt. A Return obtained by Mr. Robertson included nine ships of 11,000 tons, with speeds exceeding twenty knots. Is it impracticable to employ some of these ships in opening a mail service to Canada? The cost of alterations would be inconsiderable in comparison with the cost of building a fleet of fast ships. The Admiralty would be relieved of the cost of upkeep, and the ships would be always ready.

The Australian mail services are maintained by joint contributions from the Imperial and local Governments. In the interest of Imperial unity it is desirable that the mails should be accelerated. In future contracts it should be insisted that some at least of the ships of the contracting companies should fulfil Admiralty requirements as to speed and other essentials. The result would be to secure a well distributed and adequate number of mercantile auxiliaries and at the least cost. Fast steamships can run in conjunction with large fleets of vessels of lower speed, such as those of the Hamburg-American, North German Lloyd, and P. and O. companies, with commercial advantage to the fleets as a whole, though, individually, the fast vessels might not pay.

The policy of subsidies has not been in all respects satisfactory in the past. Many vessels to which subsidies have been paid, under agreements of recent date, have not been equal in speed to the ships formerly obtained. Nor have the engagements for preventing transfers to foreign flags been sufficiently strict. The Committee over which Lord Camperdown presided recommended that transfers should be prevented by registering the Admiralty as part owners. The Return moved for by Lord Spencer showed that expenditure on subsidies had been relatively inconsiderable. Though spread over many years it had been less than the cost of a single armoured cruiser, and far less than the cost of the eight scouts now completing. Objections have been urged to subsidies on the ground that the Navy should not depend on auxiliaries. On this it may be remarked that no increase can be proposed in the Shipbuilding Votes. In amount, and in the rate of increase, they far exceed those of France and Germany. Increased expenditure on any type must be met by reductions. In battleships completed we are in a stronger position than we have ever held before. In ships building we are below the two-Power standard. We seem to be building too many cruisers in proportion to battleships. Scouts are cruisers without protection. We shall not strengthen the Navy by cutting down battleships and laying down scouts.

It may be urged as a further objection to subsidies that they are not necessary to secure ships required in an emergency. I was a member of the Board of Admiralty which in 1885 stood face to face with a possible outbreak of war within a few days with a first-class European Power. A vote of £10,000,000 for warlike preparations had been suddenly called for by Mr. Gladstone, and granted by the House of Commons without debate. We were not prepared. It had not been the policy of Parliament or of any administration to keep the Navy fully prepared for war. It was imperative to reinforce the Navy in cruisers, and to prevent our fast merchant steamers from passing under foreign flags. A Government in difficulties cannot negotiate on favourable terms. Our experiences were not lost upon our successors. In 1887, when contracts for the conveyance of the mails to New York were being renewed, they addressed a letter to the Treasury, an extract from which I will read—

> "My Lords would desire to state that the experience derived from the events of 1885 has led them to believe that true economy and real efficiency would be best promoted by securing the use to the Admiralty in time of peace of the fastest and most serviceable mercantile vessels. It will be remembered that in 1885 a sum approximating to £600,000 was expended in retaining the services of several fast merchant steamers, so as to prevent their being available for the service of any Power inimical to the interests of the United Kingdom. Had arrangements existed similar to those now contemplated, their Lordships believe that a very considerable portion of this expenditure would have been averted, and a degree of confidence felt by the nation on which it is very difficult to place a money value."

Turning from reserves of ships to the reserve forces for manning the Navy, new and important branches of the Reserve have been recently enrolled in the Colonies and at home. It is satisfactory to learn from the First Lord's statement that these reserves have made a good start. It would be of interest to Parliament and the country to have the latest information as to recruiting, the provision of drill-sheds, the numbers embarked in His Majesty's ships and their discipline and efficiency. Nor should the training of the officers of the Naval Reserve be neglected. Nothing has been done for the professional training of the cadets and the midshipmen entered in large numbers in the Reserve. The mail services to our Colonies should be organised as a national service, and the vessels utilised as training ships for officers of the Reserve, and for the training of those British seamen and firemen who are so much needed to man our mercantile marine. Subsidised mail steamers should be utilised for the training of junior engineers and newly-entered stokers of the Navy.

In conclusion, the charge for subsidies, limited to those special services for which they seem to be required, would be inconsiderable. We do not want many ships to do scouting for the Fleet. Lord Charles Beresford asked for eight. Shall we say twelve ships? Take the annual subsidy at £500,000. Assume a contribution from Canada of £200,000 a year. Let us hope for some aid from the Australasian dependencies. Let us assume a contribution from the Post Office. The balance chargeable on Navy Votes would be a small payment for the reinforcement of the Fleet in a class of ships indispensable for efficiency in time of war, and which in peace would be the training squadron for our Reserves. As mail steamers they would be a link with the Colonies. In naval administration nothing can be done well which is done hastily. I ask the Government to give consideration to the subject which I have, I fear.

imperfectly dealt with, and to act when opportunities offer.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (The Marquess of LINLITHGOW): My Lords, I wish in the first place to acknowledge on behalf of the First Lord of the Admiralty the kind words spoken by the noble Lord with reference to his enforced absence from this House. I am sure your Lordships will understand that no one regrets more than the noble Earl himself his inability to reply in person to the remarks of the noble Lord opposite, whose long connection and close acquaintance with the question of naval reserve in all its branches is well known to your Lordships, and whose views on these subjects are always entitled to the greatest respect both from the Admiralty and from your Lordships' House.

The noble Lord has in his speech dealt with two subjects—the question of subsidies to merchant cruisers and the state of the Reserve *personnel* for the Fleet. Now with regard to subsidies, from the point of view of the Admiralty the question of the advantages to be gained by various Colonies or by the mercantile marine from the subsidising from public funds of fast merchant ships, however desirable in themselves, is one which must be kept quite distinct from that of securing the assistance for the Fleet in time of war of fast merchant ships to be used as scouts or armed cruisers. It is for the latter urpose only that money from naval funds can be expended. Before embarking on any proposal to spend money in subsidising merchant ships, the Admiralty have carefully to consider whether such a plan is in the end more economical and efficient than that of building warships to do the work. It must be remembered that when the policy of subsidising merchant steamers to be used as auxiliaries to the Fleet in war was inaugurated, the best merchant ships of the day excelled in sea speed the fastest warships. Since then the speed of merchant ships has increased, but the increase is but slight when compared with the corresponding increase in the speed of warships. Speed is the essential quality, whether these ships are used as scouts or as armed cruisers, and the cost of building a merchant vessel of such speed as to be of much service for these purposes is becoming almost prohibitive.

The noble Lord alluded to the small amount of money paid in subsidies for merchant cruisers relatively to the cost of building a scout. But in this connection I would point out that the subvention paid for one of these merchant vessels is in the nature of a retaining fee, and the cost of hiring them in time of war would be very large. For instance, let me take the first ship on the Admiralty list of such ships at the beginning of 1905—the "Oceanic." Her annual subvention is £10,000 a year. The cost of her armament excluding that of fitting it on board, would be about £26,000; and her surrender value, which would be claimed if she were lost while in the Government service, is £705,617; so that if the "Oceanic" were lost in war she would have cost the country a sum approaching a million of money. On the other hand, the estimated cost of one of the new scouts, some of which have been recently put in commission, is £294,204 when complete and ready for commission. Without controverting in any way the noble Lord's view of the useful part which ships of the merchant service could play in war, I have said enough to show that the financial side of the question is one which the Admiralty have very steadily to keep in view.

Turning to the second part of the noble Lord's speech, I am able to say that the composition and training of the Naval Reserve forces is receiving the attention of the Admiralty at the present time. The work of the *personnel* of the Navy is constantly undergoing change and improvement, and the problem of the means of keeping the men who do not belong to the active service of the Navy in peace time fully acquainted with the duties which will be demanded of them in war is one which they must always have before their minds. It is difficult to impart to men of the Naval Reserve adequate training in drill batteries on shore, and the expense of keeping the ordnance in these batteries always up to date is very great. Far more can be learnt by a course of service on board sea-going warships of the Fleet, where the actual conditions of service afloat are present.

With regard to the recruiting of Royal Naval Reserve men, the full number estimated for was reached long before the end of the last financial year, the figures of the entries in the various branches being—1,595 seamen, 1,062 firemen (ordinary), 788 firemen (special) and 488 engine-room artificers. Good reports as to the efficiency of the men engaged in the Colonial Reserves continue to be received from Australia and Newfoundland. At Malta the Reserve has been formed so recently (about twelve months ago) that sufficient *data* as to its usefulness are not yet forthcoming. There is a special difficulty, *i.e.*, the slight knowledge of the English language possessed by a number of the men enlisted.

The work of the new Naval Volunteer Reserve is steadily progressing. Two new divisions for the Mersey and Sussex were formed during 1904, and another has recently been created on the Tyne. Besides drill-sheds, some of the divisions have been provided with naval vessels. In addition to the "Buzzard," which was taken over by the London Division last year and moored in the Thames, the "Rose" cutter has been lent to the Clyde Division, and the "Melita" is being similarly prepared for the Mersey Division. As the noble Lord is no doubt aware, a branch of the Reserve from which the Admiralty have great expectations is the Royal Fleet Reserve, composed entirely of men who have served as active service ratings in the Fleet. The numbers of this Reserve, apart from the "A" or pensioner class, has now reached over 7,000—namely, 4,982 seamen and stokers and 2,152 marines—and the new system of engaging special or non-continuous service seamen on the condition that they will enter the Fleet Reserve on discharge should add materially to its strength later on.

ARMY (YEOMANRY).

LORD WENLOCK rose "To ask the Under-Secretary of State for War what were the intentions of His Majesty's Government as to the mobilisation and training of the Imperial Yeomanry." The noble Lord said: My Lords, I have placed this notice on the Paper for the purpose of eliciting such information as my noble friend can give as to the intentions of the Government with regard to organising the Yeomanry and putting it on a proper and sound footing in case it should be called up for any sudden military purpose; and I think I am encouraged in calling attention to this particular subject by the fact that since my Question was put down the Secretary of State for War in another place, when referring to the Imperial Yeomanry, said—

> "I believe there is no force in His Majesty's Service from which we obtain better value for money expended than the Imperial Yeomanry."

It is thirty-five years since I first joined the Yeomanry, and I am sure there are many noble Lords in this House who also remember the old days, when a great deal of trouble was taken to place the Yeomanry on a proper footing and to train it on sound principles. They will remember how in those earlier days we were subjected to a certain amount of derision and were neglected, and I am sure they will be glad now to hear, on the authority of the Secretary of State for War, that this force is at the present time most satisfactory, and that there is no force from which His Majesty's Government obtain better value for money expended.

I think it is not unreasonable that those of us who take an active part in this work should ask His Majesty's Government how far they are prepared to place the force on a still more satisfactory footing. I am, of course, alluding to what might happen in the event of the force being mobilised and called upon to undertake serious work in an emergency. All of us who are in the position of commanding officers of Yeomanry regiments must feel that at present we are rather acting as independent units and that we have no cohesion at all. There is nobody to place us in brigades or divisions, nor do we know exactly where to turn on mobilisation. I feel that this is hardly a satisfactory position, and I hope His

Majesty's Government will embrace the present opportunity, when we are at peace, and there is leisure, of bringing up some scheme that will in this respect place the Yeomanry in a much better position than they occupy at the present moment. The Yeomanry should know what their position will be. Their stores should be in perfect order, and their transport and other matters so arranged that they could fall into line without delay.

Another point upon which I desire information is as to the intention of the Government with regard to horsing regiments if they should be suddenly called upon for action. I understand that this duty is to be entrusted to the Remount Department. I would ask my noble friend the Under-Secretary whether he thinks the Remount Department can possibly horse all the Yeomanry in under seven days, even if they can do it so quickly. I believe I could re-horse the whole of my regiment in a couple of days, and if this matter were left in the hands of commanding officers I am sure it would be very much more satisfactorily arranged, while the Remount Department could devote their attention to making arrangements for filling up any casualties that might occur at future stages of the operations. Again, it would be a very valuable thing if senior officers in this force had an opportunity of attending classes and lectures for instruction in the higher branches of their work. I have myself attended the only school at the disposal of the Yeomanry at Aldershot, but I found, as a senior officer, that the information imparted was hardly of a nature to be satisfactory to myself. I should be glad if a school of the kind I have mentioned could be instituted which senior officers could attend, and also if facilities could be given to those officers to attend manœuvres.

We have reached a certain stage in regard to the Yeomanry movement, and I do not think we ought to stand still. I hope I shall obtain from the noble Earl an assurance that the Government are looking into this matter, and will be able to do more for the force than they have done up to the present. At the same time I must say the Yeomanry are extremely grateful to the Government for what they have done in the past, and I am glad to see that the Government, on their side, recognise that for what they have done for the Yeomanry theyhave had ample return. I should also like to ask the noble Earl whether it is not possible for us to have our own drill-book. Legislation by reference is very unsatisfactory, but drill by reference is more unsatisfactory. We are given a small drill-book, and are told that we shall find other information in the cavalry drill-book. I certainly think that a force which numbers some 25,000 officers and men might be allowed to have their own drill-book entirely to themselves. This is rather a small matter, but it is one which I should like, while we are on the subject, to bring to the notice of my noble friend. I beg to move for Papers.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers relating to the mobilisation and training of the Imperial Yeomanry."—(*Lord Wenlock.*)

*LORD HARRIS: My Lords, if I might add a few remarks to what my noble friend has said, they would be in the direction of asking for something definite as to orders on mobilisation. I have been living for some years under certain orders as regards where my regiment is to mobilise in the event of England being threatened, and, of course, I have made all my dispositions accordingly. But apparently within the last year or so the system of command in the part of the country where my regiment is quartered and recruited has entirely changed, and all the correspondence which I have had over a period of, I should think, at least five years, has, I suppose, been transferred to some other officer, because the office with which I have been corresponding tell me now that they have nothing whatever to do with the regiment. I understand that the general officer who has been commanding at Dover has now nothing whatever to do with the Yeomanry. All my correspondence for five years or more has been with that officer, and I suppose that by some arrangement made at the War Office all that correspondence will be handed over to the officer who is entrusted now with Yeomanry matters.

When a change of officers takes place it frequently happens that a change of views takes place. I have been under orders all these years that on the word "mobilise" being circulated I was to be mobilised at a certain place. Last year I received an order that one squadron was to mobilise at some other place, so I naturally asked where the other three squadrons were to mobilise, and I was told they were not to mobilise at all. That is a remarkable change in orders, and it is curious that the one squadron specially selected was to mobilise inside a fortress. Naturally a horse regiment cannot do very much inside a fortress, However, I think I am justified in asking who is going to supply the horses, because hitherto no arrangements whatever have been made as regards the horses for Yeomanry regiments on mobilisation. The men are bound to bring their horses to the annual training, for which they are paid £5, but there is nothing in the terms of their enlistment which compels them to bring horses if the regiment is mobilised; and I ask, who is going to undertake to find the horses—whether the men had better bring their own and the country compensate them afterwards, or whether the Government propose to find them. I was told that the Government were going to find them. I think it is a legitimate question to ask whether any arrangements have been made to supply Yeomen with horses when they get the word to mobilise. If we may gather anything definite from the speech made in another place by the Prime Minister, it is that if this country is to be attacked in earnest the attack is going to be very sudden, and, therefore, that Auxiliary regiments that have to mobilise will have to do so very suddenly. Obviously the horses will be wanted in a hurry. Are we to depend on centralised organisation for sending horses down to parts of the country most immediately threatened, or is there any existing arrangement by which the local authorities might—I hardly like to use the word commandeer—engage horses, or be able to obtain them, on an occasion of that kind?

I hope the noble Lord will also look into the question of mobilisation stores. Some years ago, during the war, the War Office issued a very remarkable order—that Yeomanry commanding officers were to make arrangements with local tradesmen for the supply of a very large number of articles. I should think quite three pages of small print were occupied in detailing these articles, which were to be kept in stock by the local tradesmen for an indefinite time without any remuneration whatever, except that at the end of the time, whatever that might be—it might be fifty years—the tradesmen were to have, I think, 5 per cent. increase on the Government price. There was not, therefore, very much profit to the local tradesmen in it, and your Lordships will not be surprised to hear that on making inquiries of every local tradesman of sufficient capacity to supply a large number of articles of this kind, I found no one in the least inclined to embark in the venture, and for three years I have been arguing with the local military authorities and endeavouring to prove to them that this was not a commercial transaction which appealed to local tradesmen.

Lord Harris.

My efforts had been without avail until the other day, when the Government amended their previous order and allowed that the articles need not be of Army pattern, but I was still to make arrangements with the local tradesmen to keep them in stock. What I eventually succeeded in doing was this. I informed the military authorities that there were certain tradesmen who kept certain articles of approximately similar character in stock, and I hoped they would be forthcoming when wanted, but I could not give any guarantee that some other regiment would not get in before me and take all the things I was depending on. That is not a practical scheme. I think that the large majority of these articles would be forthcoming upon the initiative of the Yeoman himself as soon as the word to mobilise went round, and that the Yeomanry regiment would be found where it was wanted without these voluminous prearrangements. But, at the same time, I suggest it is not a practical way of dealing with the matter to give orders which in themselves are absolutely impossible of being carried out.

There are two other subjects besides mobilisation stores and horses which require attention—namely, musketry schools for officers and non-commissioned officers, and a signalling school. Yeomanry officers may be able to give one particular month in the year at Hythe, but it is almost certain that on that month the school is already full. There are parts of the musketry course which are not absolutely essential for Yeomanry officers, and it might be possible to work out a shortened course and allow it to take place elsewhere than at Hythe. In that way I am sure we should be able to supply a very much larger number of officers capable of giving good instructions to their men in musketry. Signalling is a most important subject, and one which many officers and men are very willing to take up. At present in my regiment there is a great deal of signalling done, because there are prizes given and the men are ready to take it up. But it is absolutely impossible for a regiment to earn anything for the corps unless an officer has attended a signalling class and obtained a certificate. It is necessary for him to go to a class for two months. It is really impossible for a great majority of Yeomanry officers to find two consecutive months to give to this voluntary military work, and I cannot help thinking that it would be possible for a scheme to be worked out involving some less time than the rather long period of two months. If an officer could get a certificate for signalling more easily than he can at present, I am quite sure that the War Office would find that signalling in the Yeomanry, which apparently is neglected, though, as I have said, many officers and men have taken it up, would be even more extensively learnt.

I do not want to be thought for one moment as saying that the Yeomanry have any reason to grumble at the attitude of the Government towards that force. In my opinion the Yeomanry have every reason to be most grateful to the Government for the assistance which they have received. That assistance has instilled absolutely new life into the whole force, and has enabled everything to be done in a much more business-like way; and we are doing what I believe to be more useful than anything else—we are turning out annually into the country a large number of young men who have been taught how to ride and shoot. I am certain that the next time any serious war threatens this country a much larger number of healthy young men will volunteer for service at home or abroad than hitherto; and that result will have been achieved by the very kindly and liberal treatment which this Government have afforded to the Yeomanry forces.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): My Lords, I am very glad to see that officers in your Lordships' House, representing the Imperial Yeomanry, so thoroughly reciprocate the efforts we have been able to make in the direction of helping that force. I can assure your Lordships that nothing gives livelier satisfaction to my colleagues on the Army Council than to note the improvement that has been made in the force, and the enthusiasm of its officers to keep on improving it. Your Lordships will have noticed that there is a complete absence of carping criticism on the part of the speakers this afternoon, and I can assure them, in the few remarks which it will be necessary for me to make, that we intend to try and do our utmost to help them in the direction that I know they wish to go.

Your Lordships will remember the debates we had on this subject last year. I am glad to say that we have already been able to meet Yeomanry officers on many of the points then raised. A debate was initiated last year by the noble Lord opposite, Lord Lovat, in which he laid great stress on the need in the Yeomanry of another weapon. We recognised the justice of the views put forward on that occasion and we did, during the winter, supply the Yeomanry with a second weapon. We were also glad to meet a suggestion made by the noble Marquess, Lord Winchester, that we should allow men to re-engage in future from year to year. We have also, partly in deference to criticisms that were made last year, initiated a new scheme of inspection, and, though it has not been referred to this evening, I may perhaps be allowed to say that we have found the new system of inspection, tried this year, work most satisfactorily; the inspections have been most useful and practical as regards the corps concerned, and we certainly intend to continue the system.

As to the question just raised by Lord Harris — that of signalling — we recognised last year that it was a grievance that no grant could be earned by any corp unless it had eight men efficient, and we were able to lighten the terms for earning this grant. We have made arrangements by which four efficient men in a corps can earn a grant—a certain amount, but not the whole £12 which the eight men could earn. But when we try to go the whole extent advocated by the noble Lord, and permit of a shorter course of instruction for officers to enable them to qualify for this grant we run our head, if I may use the phrase, against a brick wall of considerable thickness. The reason is this. It is the opinion of those who are concerned in these matters at the War Office that a signaller is no use to the Army unless he is absolutely efficient. Signalling is, in itself, most important, and it is also most important that an officer's knowledge of signalling should be efficient. The evil consequences that might follow from mistakes in signalling are so serious that we object most strongly to any suggestion of lowering the standard, I am sorry not to be able to meet the wishes of the noble Lord on this point, but I am afraid we shall never be able to make the course of signalling easier than it is at the present time.

I now come to a Question asked by Lord Wenlock with regard to a class for senior officers. The first difficulty we have had to deal with in this matter has been that of accommodation at our cavalry school, but I hope that difficulty will soon be removed. It has not been found practicable hitherto to have more than four courses a year for Yeomanry officers, and it has not, therefore, been possible to squeeze in a course for senior officers. I daresay your Lordships are aware that it is our intention to considerably increase the size of the cavalry school, and it may then be found practicable—I cannot give any pledge, because I have not gone into the question with the proper authorities—to have a course for senior officers. But information rather tends in the direction of showing that if we did have a course for senior officers there would not be many senior officers who would attend it. In England, at any rate, a great many of the senior officers are ex-cavalry officers, and I doubt very much whether an officer who has been some time in the cavalry could get very much instruction out of a course for senior officers held at the cavalry school. I will, however, undertake that the point shall not be lost sight of when the accommodation is increased. As regards manœuvres. we are at present considering whether, if we have manœuvres next year, we can attach senior Yeomanry officers to those manœuvres for instruction, and in that way meet one of the points raised by the noble Lord opposite.

Lord WENLOCK: Does the noble Earl say definitely that we are to be attached to manœuvres?

*The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: No, I say the matter is being considered. It is all a question of pounds, shillings, and pence, but I have every hope that we shall be able to do it. I now come to another point raised by Lord Harris, as to the possibility of our having local courses for musketry instruction. We are very much opposed at present to allowing these courses. Assuming that they were to be considered in the same way as courses at Hythe, and were to earn the Hythe certificate, the effect of such courses would be to depreciate the value of the Hythe certificate itself. I know that that Answer will be very unsatisfactory to my noble friend Lord Lovat, but I think his corps supply a very special case. I believe that a local course held in Scotland for the purpose of training the two Scottish regiments might possibly be attended with success; for this reason, that we should be working at once upon material of a special character. We should be training men already skilled in the use of the rifle and the telescope, and I believe that a short course might be arranged with advantage in my noble friend's special case, but I cannot admit that a course held away from Hythe for the Yeomanry in general, or any regiment of Yeomanry, could possibly compare in value with a course at Hythe.

I know it may be objected that Hythe is a long way from certain parts of the United Kingdom, and that it is inconvenient for officers from a distance to attend. I should think there was greater force in that objection if experience showed that officers residing near Hythe were better attendants at the course than officers living at a distance, but that is not the case. I have received a letter from the Commandant of the Hythe School of Musketry, who says that officers living at a distance find that they are quite as able to attend the classes as officers living close by. I am afraid that I can hold out no hope that we shall be able to organise classes for musketry instruction for officers in different parts of the country, at any rate at the present moment.

I now come to the question of organisation, touched on by Lord Wenlock and by Lord Harris. I stated about a fortnight ago that resulting on the recent decision of the Defence Committee a new scheme of organisation was being worked out for the United Kingdom. Of course, the Imperial Yeomanry have a full appearance in that scheme, but we have not yet finally decided upon it; and, therefore, I must ask noble Lords not to press me to give any details of it at present. Indeed, I should think that it would be very improper that minute details should ever be published, owing to the obvious unwisdom of making known your mobilisation arrangements before you put them in force. They will, of course, have to be confidentially communicated to commanders of regiments and of troops, but the details of any scheme of mobilisation for home defence would obviously be of the greatest possible interest to foreign Powers, and it would not be wise, therefore, for us to publish them. I can assure the noble Lord that real and substantial progress has been made in the direction which he rightly considers so important.

As regards the supply of horses, the present arrangement is that the Remount Department shall horse Yeomanry regiments on mobilisation. We believe that in time of war, when the Remount Department would have its hands, so to speak, on almost every horse in the kingdom, and would have already made very considerable demands on the horse supply, they would be able with more certainty to provide the horses requisite for the Imperial Yeomanry regiments than would be the case if this were left to the colonels of regiments. On mobilisation the Remount Department would at once make very great demands upon the country, and there would be nothing to protect a colonel of a regiment losing all or a very large part of the horses which he had been counting on by their being bought by the Remount Department without his knowing anything about it. We think it is safer to have one buyer only in the field at a time of great stress, and when great demands are suddenly made on the market. That is the reason why it is thought better that the Remount Department should be entrusted with the horsing of the Imperial Yeomanry when war breaks out.

As to making contracts for mobilisation stores, I am sorry to hear of Lord Harris's want of success in this matter. I think he a little under-estimated the amount that the contractor is to get. I think the price is to be 16 per cent. over cost price; but that is a small detail after all. I note that the noble Lord is not very much impressed with the necessity of making these arrangements at all, and I am sure he would agree with me that most of the articles required are articles in common use, which it is practically certain could be bought at very short notice if required. However, I believe that some regiments have been lately more fortunate than Lord Harris.

*LORD HARRIS: I have heard of one that was able to make the contract for one year.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I have not got the particulars with me, but I believe a certain number of regiments have been able to make verbal contracts, and one or two have been more fortunate and have made written ones; but I admit there has not been that great success under this particular head that I should like to have seen. With regard to the final matter referred to by Lord Wenlock, I believe there was a new Yeomanry training book issued, but I understand from the noble Lord that there is too much instruction by reference in it, and that he would like a more complete manual. This, of course, is only a matter of printing, and I shall be very glad to inquire if such a book as the noble Lord asks for could be conveniently issued. I am glad to note the turn the debate has taken, and I can assure your Lordships that we hope we shall be able during the forthcoming winter to meet some of the points that have been raised by noble Lords representing the Imperial Yeomanry in the same way as we were able to meet points raised last session.

LORD LOVAT: My Lords, if we could have heard the Answer of the noble Earl before the criticisms were made, I do not think the remarks of noble Lords this evening would have been of quite so friendly a spirit. The very same points were brought up by myself last session, and practically, with two exceptions, we are in exactly the same position as we were then. We are given the same old reason, that there is a mobilisation scheme being prepared. I have been in His Majesty's service for sixteen years, and I can remember no year when it was not stated that there was going to be a mobilisation scheme in force the following year, but we have never yet had one published—I do not mean published in the ordinary sense, but commanding officers should know its general details as regards themselves. The question of training was brought up last year, and once more we are met with a statement that it will be considered.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: The question of training has not been raised this afternoon at all.

LORD LOVAT: The question of short courses of musketry instruction, a school for senior officers, and other matters in connection with training have been referred to. The question of the training of junior officers in musketry was raised last year, and the views then expressed were supported by Lord Roberts. The number of officers who have been to Hythe to attend the Yeomanry course has not very considerably increased from last year, and in consequence the training of the Yeomanry in musketry is not by any means what could be desired. The noble Earl has referred to mine as a special case. I fail to see how in any way I constitute a special case for a short course in musketry. As a matter of fact, the Commander-in-Chief for Scotland has been particularly keen on this question. He paid a visit to London to try to get this question of short courses considered, seeing the necessity for having them, and he had a class ready to take up of fifty-seven officers, had he been authorised by the War Office. That was one class alone. If this were done generally, the musketry of the Yeomanry, which is not in a satisfactory condition, might be raised to a very much higher standard.

With regard to senior officers, that question was brought up last year, and we were told that if we waited something might be done. We are again given no definite promise that we are to have a class for senior Yeomanry officers. Is it not absurd that Yeomanry officers should have to go through exactly the same course of training as majors as they go through as subalterns? I wonder what would happen if the Education Department were run by the War Office, and they abandoned standards and put everyone through the junior forms. I do not think educationalists would stand that method of training very long. If that method would be bad in regard to ordinary instruction, why should it be adopted for military instruction? The noble Earl says that ex-cavalry officers would not attend the class. I happen to have been a cavalry officer and I certainly would like to go to a senior class. As far as I remember, three of the Yeomanry regiments in the North of Scotland are commanded by officers who were in the cavalry, and they all wish to go to a senior class. An officer trained as a captain or a subaltern in a cavalry regiment has not to write brigade orders and regimental orders in the same way that he does when he commands a regiment. The ex-cavalry officer does not necessarily know the whole duties of a Yeomanry commanding officer. The seniors, as we note from the report, are not so well reported on as some of the junior officers, and it is not reasonable that they should be. The seniors have so much more to learn. On mobilisation they will have to compete against the best cavalry officers of whatever force might land on our shores, and, therefore, it is essential that they should be fully up to their work. Surely we are entitled to ask for at least one class a year in which these officers can be trained. I can imagine no more reasonable request than that your senior officers should be given an opportunity to make themselves efficient for their position.

As to the general question of mobilisation, we had that subject brought up last year, and we were then told that in the future some mobilisation scheme was to be put before us. We do not wish, naturally, to have the details published, but we do wish to know certain general principles. We would like to know if we are to be brigaded, and, if we are, who is to staff those brigades. At a Yeomanry meeting the other day the opinion was expressed that not one single regiment could spare senior officers to go on the staff. Of Staff College officers there are only two cavalry men in England at the present time who are unemployed. Where are the staff to come from to look after the brigades of Imperial Yeomanry? We should like to have a definite statement on the subject. We asked for it last year. Time goes on, and we are still in the same position. Surely it would be an advantage if we were told where our mobilisation stations were, and where we should have to go. It is not necessary to elaborate that. If Yeomanry colonels knew exactly what portion of the country they were going to, they could study it, make their arrangements about transport and horses, and have maps ready which would enable them to be a fighting force at once.

Then, on the question of horses, we have had a most unsatisfactory Answer. We are told that a central body is to arrange for the provision of horses for the whole Yeomanry—some 25,000 horses. Surely it would be better for the Yeomanry colonels to provide them themselves. It is an easy matter for Yeomanry colonels to ear-mark certain horses and notify the fact that they have so ear-marked them at headquarters. The Commander in-Chief in Scotland gave instructions that all the horses attached to his command were to have a price put on them, and that price is reported, so that if the whole of the Yeomanry were mobilised to-morrow, he would not only know where his horses are, but the price that would have to be paid for them. What is the use of having this central command? If there is an invasion the wires will no doubt be cut, and orders for horses will be delayed in transmission. This is a question which I hope the noble Earl will consider. I do not think any of our Questions to-day on the subject of training, or with regard to mobilisation, are at all unfair. The statements which have been made in both Houses of Parliament have shown that Yeomanry officers have done their best as far as their units go to become as efficient as possible, that hard and good work has been put in; and I think it is a fair request that we should ask the War Office to so far help us that we may not only be efficient in ourselves but become an efficient engine in war, and that we certainly cannot be until our staff is put in a proper position, until our senior officers are trained, until our men are given full opportunity of being able to shoot well, and until our horses, equipment, and stores are put on such a footing as to be on hand at once.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I should like to support the views of the noble Lord who has just sat down on two points. The first point is with regard to a school of musketry. I appreciate very much the importance of the school at Hythe. That school, even if others were established, would always be the most important school; but I do not see that the value of Hythe would be depreciated if other schools were formed in different parts of the country. I feel very strongly on this subject, for if these schools were established they would give facilities for Yeomanry officers to go through a musketry course. No doubt, as the noble Earl said, those who live near Hythe do not attend more than those who live at a distance, but I do not think that is a solid argument. Common sense indicates that if there were more schools of musketry in various parts of the country it would be a very great advantage to the Auxiliary Forces generally. This is a very important matter. We all know that attention has been called to the necessity of greater efficiency in rifle-shooting, and if these additional schools of musketry are not established I think it will be a very great mistake.

I heartily agree with Lord Lovat as to the extremely unsatisfactory nature of the Answer given by the noble Earl with regard to the horsing of the Yeomanry. If you leave the getting of horses for the Yeomanry in an emergency to the Remount Department, it will be doing the same thing which the Duke of Bedford spoke of with regard to the Militia—destroying the local interest in the force. I feel convinced that the colonels of these regiments would be very much more able to find the horses than a central authority. The noble Earl said that when mobilisation was about to take place the Government would practically have their hand on nearly every horse. I do not exactly understand that. I am quite aware that in old days certain horses were at the call of the Government, but I do not know in what way they have a hold on private property. I feel that it would be very much better to use the local knowledge of the Yeomanry officers and those interested rather than leave this entirely, as is proposed, to the central Remount Department.

Lord WENLOCK: Has the noble Earl the Under-Secretary any objection to acceding to my Motion for Papers.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: What Papers do you want? I have no Papers.

Lord WENLOCK: I heard with astonishment that in the event of sudden emergency remount agents were to go about the country buying horses. I do not think it would be possible for any one regiment to be horsed by remount agents under a week or ten days; and, judging by what happened when the remount agents went round my part of Yorkshire during the South African War, all I can say is, "God help us if we are to have that class of animal landed on us." It was commonly stated by the farmers in the neighbourhood that after the remount agents had been there, there was not a bad horse left in the whole county. With regard to this question of providing horses, I should be very glad if the noble Earl could produce any Papers on the subject to show how it has been dealt with.

***Lord HARRIS**: I am under an obligation at this moment to mobilise on the second day after receiving orders. Perhaps the noble Earl will explain how the horses are to arrive by then?

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: The point I attempted to make clear was this. Long before war breaks out it is perfectly obvious that the Remount Department will set to work buying horses, and we shall have large depôts all over the country. That is under the present remount scheme, which has been published. I think your Lordships would find that we should have probably bought all the Yeomanry horses long before the Yeomanry were called out, and therefore we should have enormous stocks of horses on hand and should be able to horse these regiments more quickly than the colonels themselves.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of Halsbury): Do I understand the noble Earl to agree to produce the Papers moved for?

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: I do not know that there are any to produce.

On Question, Motion agreed to; and ordered accordingly.

ARMY ORGANISATION.

The Earl of WEMYSS: My Lords, I rise "To ask the Under-Secretary of State for War what is the present district or divisional organisation of the Army, Militia, and Volunteers in the matter of commands, transport, and armaments, including big moveable guns of position, and as regards their readiness in all ways to take the field and be transported at shortest notice, and within what time, to the point on the east coast nearest to their district or divisional headquarters."

A very few words will explain the reason why I have placed this notice on the Paper. It will be in your Lordships' recollection that a week ago to-day a Resolution which I had the privilege of submitting to the House was accepted by the Government and adopted unanimously by your Lordships. The latter part of that Resolution declared that—

> "It is needful that our land defences should at all times be such that no nation would ever attempt in any form a hostile landing on our shores."

The Question I am asking follows, as a matter of course, from the adoption of that Resolution. "At all times" naturally includes the present time, and I think your Lordships must feel, especially after the speech of Lord Lovat, that we ought to know exactly the present state of matters as regards home defence. That is my reason for putting down this notice. I have no doubt that the Answer which I shall receive will not be satisfactory, and as the Question is so important I reserve to myself the right, in that event, of bringing the subject again before your Lordships at a later date.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, I confess at once that I have had some difficulty in understanding this Question, but I gather that the noble Earl wishes a great deal of detailed information as to our present mobilisation scheme. It is obvious that it would not be in the public interest that we should give details of our mobilisation scheme. All the information concerning the organisation of the military forces at home and abroad which it is considered desirable to make public is contained in the monthly Army List. There are six main commands in the United Kingdom and five in India, including the Burmah command. In peace, eight field Army divisions are organised at home and ten in India. Four cavalry brigades are formed in the United Kingdom. There are, in addition, in the United Kingdom ten coast defence commands and thirteen territorial districts, whose commanders and staffs are additional to the divisional and brigade commands. Details regarding the mobilisation of the field army and of defences are confidential, and no information can be published regarding the arrangements for organising in war at home or abroad bodies of troops other than those which are shown in the Army List. Questions of armament are also treated as confidential.

***Lord HARRIS**: My Lords, I did not gather that the Question addressed to the noble Earl referred only to mobilisation, and I would suggest that information should be given as to the altered conditions of the various commands. Under the old arrangement the general officer commanding a district commanded all branches of the Army—Regular, Auxiliary, cavalry, artillery, engineers, infantry, and supply. I am told that all that has been changed, and that the general officer commanding a district may have nothing whatever to do with cavalry quartered in his district, nothing whatever to do with artillery quartered in his district, and nothing whatever to do, I suppose, with engineers, but certainly nothing whatever to do with Yeomanry or Militia artillery. I can understand that the divisional commander may have a good deal to do with all these, but the officer who used to be the general officer commanding a district may now be only an officer commanding an infantry division. This appears to me to be a very remarkable change. I do not suggest for a moment that it is not an advisable one. I have the greatest confidence in the military authorities devising a good scheme; but it seemed to me that the noble Earl's reply was not very complete, and referred only to mobilisation, and not to the subject of organisation.

I am told that in one divisional command there is a fortress, and the general officer who has been commanding in the local military area, having at one time had command of cavalry and artillery as well as other branches, has now no control in that fortress over certain garrison batteries that are there. For instance, the canteen is under his command, but if the garrison gunners kick up a row in the canteen he has no control over them. If a Militia artillery regiment is assembled in the neighbourhood for its month's training, and if some of the men are arrested by his picket he has no authority over them. There is now, I suppose, a fortress commander, a special commander of engineers, a special commander of Yeomanry, and all those will be responsible, I take it, to a divisional commander. But the officer who was commanding in the local military area has now nothing like the combined command he once had. It seems that the number of general officers who are now exercising command over several branches of the service must be very limited indeed. I have only ventured to interpose these few remarks because it seemed to me that the reply of the noble Earl the Under-Secretary did not deal with the whole of the Question placed on the Paper by the noble Earl.

The **Earl of DONOUGHMORE**: My Lords, I am afraid I do not recognise in the Question addressed to me any request that I should enter into the details of reorganisation of command. If the noble Lord will put the Questions on the Paper to which he desires an Answer I shall be happy to look into the matter and give him the information.

The **Earl of WEMYSS**: My Lords, I consider the Answer I have received unsatisfactory, because it evaded altogether the direct Question which I put to the noble Earl, who rode off on the question of secrecy. I do not desire information as to secret arrangements. His Majesty's Government have undertaken to be always and at all times in that state of home defence that no nation would ever attempt in any form a hostile landing on our shores. I only desire to be assured that the arrangements are such as would fulfil those conditions. Does the noble Earl imagine that the Military Attachés do not know all the War Office secrets, and how many guns and men they have got? Of course they do; and it is nothing but throwing dust in the eyes of the nation to give an Answer such as the noble Earl has given to-day. I shall take an early opportunity of recurring to the question.

EPIZOOTIC LYMPHANGITIS.

Lord BURGHCLERE: My Lords, I rise "To ask His Majesty's Government how many cases of epizootic lymphangitis in military depots had occurred in Great Britain before the issue of the Board of Agriculture's Circular to local authorities of January 26th, 1904; how many cases have been reported from the same sources since that date up to the present month; whether any cases of the disease have occurred amongst horseowners or others in Great Britain; and whether the Government will issue a Return of the number of horses shipped from South Africa which were affected by the disease, and died or were destroyed on the journey home."

Those of your Lordships who were present on a previous occasion when a discussion arose with regard to this particular horse disease, will not be surprised that further inquiry should be addressed to the Government on the subject, especially with regard to its existence in Great Britain and the measures that have been taken by the Government to protect horseowners and others from any danger of their horses contracting the disease. We have learnt that this disease is a highly contagious one, which was imported, I believe, from South Africa amongst the Army horses that were sent from that country after the war. It is a disease the contagion of which is not only immediate, but what is called co-mediate—that is to say, a groom or a person in contact with a horse suffering from this disease might convey it on his person or in some other way to other horses just in the same manner as certain cattle diseases can be conveyed.

It is also a disease the period of incubation of which is in some cases very lengthy. It may be from three weeks to three months, but there are cases which have extended as far as a year and even thirteen months, though I believe that is exceptional. I mention this fact in order to show your Lordships the danger there is of this disease being conveyed if horses are not either slaughtered or quarantined. The Questions on the Paper also refer to the military depôts, and I am glad to see my noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for War here, as possibly he will be able to give us some information on this question which may not be in the possession of the noble Lord who represents the Board of Agriculture.

I should like to ask the noble Earl one or two subsidiary Questions which arise out of those which I have ventured to put on the Paper. I should like to ask my noble friend, in the first place, what precautions were taken in South Africa to prevent horses being sent over here when it was known to the authorities there that such a disease as this existed; and secondly, whether—I do not put this forward on any information of my own, but merely as a matter of inquiry—there is any truth in the report that the authorities were warned that this disease might be introduced into this country by the shipment of horses and that that warning was disregarded. I should also like to ask my noble friend what precautions have been taken in this country with regard to Army horses to prevent officers and others sending them for sale or otherwise whilst they might be in a dangerous state. It was for that reason that I ventured to point out to your Lordships the length of the time of incubation of this disease, because it is quite obvious that if carelessness was shown by the military authorities horses might be sold to other people with the germs of the disease in them, which might be spread over the country. I should like, therefore, to receive an assurance that every care was taken that these horses were not carelessly sent about the country, but were carefully looked after and quarantined for a time.

Lastly, I should like to ask my noble friend to define to us exactly what the relations of the military authorities and the Board of Agriculture have been on this subject, because I consider that to be a very important matter. Those of your Lordships who have had anything to do with the administration of the Contagious Diseases Animals Act are well aware of the difficulties that often arise in enforcing the precautions necessary to carry out that Act amongst private persons, and if there is one body which ought to assist the Board of Agriculture in this particular duty surely it is a Government Department; and I should like to be assured that that was so, and that the military authorities reported at once any case of this new disease occurring in the military depôts. I hope I shall receive a satisfactory Answer, which will put a stop to the anxiety felt on the subject and afford a feeling of safety and security to horse-owners and others interested in horses. I beg to put the Questions standing in my name, and to ask whether the Government will give a Return comprising the information asked for.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, it may perhaps be more convenient that I should first deal with the specific Questions on the Paper. The noble Lord asks, in the first place, how many cases of epizootic lymphangitis in military depôts had occurred before the issue of the circular of the Board of Agriculture to local authorities of January 26th, 1904. The Answer is 111—98 in Great Britain and 13 in Ireland. The noble Lord next asked how many cases have been reported from the same source since that date up to the present month. The number of cases reported since that date is 415. The total works out as follows:—Ireland, 37 cases, of which 2 were cured and the remainder destroyed; Great Britain, 489, of which 99 were cured, 382 destroyed, and 8 remaining. Those eight are recoveries remaining under observation, and therefore we can say that practically the disease has been stamped out as far as the Army is concerned. With regard to the Return asked for, we do not know of any horses that were shipped from South Africa while suffering from the disease; that is to say, we do not know of any horses being shipped from South Africa that were known to be diseased.

LORD BURGHCLERE: Does my noble friend say that this disease is not admitted to have been imported from South Africa?

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I understand the noble Lord to ask for a Return of the number of horses shipped from South Africa which were affected by the disease. I shall be glad to give him the total number of horses brought home, but I am told that no horses known to be suffering from this disease were shipped.

LORD BURGHCLERE: It would be satisfactory to have a Return of the horses shipped with any kind of disease. I should also like to know whether the Government were aware that this particular disease existed in South Africa before the horses were shipped.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I am informed that it did exist in South Africa, but that everybody did not know that it was epizootic lymphangitis. It was confounded with farcy.

LORD BURGHCLERE: Were any horses shipped from South Africa in a state of disease which might eventually have developed into epizootic lymphangitis?

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I am told that all the horses brought home were shipped with a clean bill of health.

EARL SPENCER: And were none thrown overboard?

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: Some horses—forty-two in number, I think—did die on the way home. But that does not prove that they were apparently diseased when they were shipped. The authorities certainly did not ship any horses knowing them to be infected.

I now come to the subsidiary Questions put to me by the noble Lord. As soon as the existence of the disease at home became known the War Office telegraphed an order to South Africa to stop all horses being sent home. I can, however, find no trace of any warning being sent from South Africa as to the existence of the disease; nor can any of the officers now in the Veterinary Department or the Remount Department remember any such warning being received. Indeed, they go further and say that the discovery of the disease here was largely instrumental in bringing to people's minds what was not clear before—its existence in South Africa. As to precautions to prevent the removal or sale of horses brought into contact with the disease, all such horses were most jealously shut up. They were not allowed to go out of the stable, or to be sold, or to associate with other horses within six months of the occurrence of the last case. As to our relations with the Board of Agriculture, we have kept that Department informed of the facts as they have occurred, and in the Report of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries for the year 1904 the noble Lord will find ample evidence of the fact that the chief of the Army Veterinary Department was working in consultation with the Board of Agriculture in the course of the action necessary in view of this outbreak.

*LORD WOLVERTON: The Question put down by my noble friend Lord Burghclere concerns primarily the Army Department, but I may possibly be able to clear up a few points in regard to the Board of Agriculture itself before the noble Earl opposite speaks. The purely civilian part of the Question, with which my noble friend did not deal, is as follows—"Whether any cases of the disease have occurred amongst horse-owners or others in Great Britain." I have in my hand a statement on that point which I think will be perfectly satisfactory to my noble friend. There have been nineteen outbreaks of this disease in civilian stables reported to the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries from April 18th, 1904, the date when the Order came into operation, to July 15th, 1905. The number of horses reported affected by the disease has been twenty-three, and the following table shows the number of outbreaks and the number of horses affected in each quarter since April, 1904. From April 18th to June 25th, 1904, there were seven outbreaks, and ten horses affected; from June to October in the same year, five outbreaks and five animals affected; from October, 1904, to January, 1905, two outbreaks and two animals affected; from January to April, 1905, two outbreaks and two animals affected; from April to June, 1905, two outbreaks and two animals affected; and from June to the present date, one outbreak and two animals affected. I think your Lordships will agree that these figures are satisfactory from the point of view of England. I have had a conversation with the President of the Board of Agriculture, and I may say that the Department are quite aware that there are two dangers in regard to this question: one the danger of the Army, with which my noble friend has dealt so ably, and the other the danger of infection being imported from Ireland. I am happy to be able to announce to your Lordships that my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Agriculture has arranged for a conference to take place between the authorities of the Board of Agriculture in London and the authorities of the Board of Agriculture in Ireland, and I feel confident that the precautions they will take will have the effect of stamping out the disease, both in England, where it is almost stamped out, and in Ireland, where it has been more prevalent.

THE EARL OF MAYO: Can the noble Lord tell me whether any horses in England were destroyed?

*LORD WOLVERTON: I am afraid I have not the figures with me but I can ascertain.

EARL SPENCER: I should like to ask whether the Board of Agriculture have made any attempt to trace the civilian cases of this disease to the centres from which they came. I was responsible for one of the rumours to which the noble Earl referred. In the few remarks that I made the other day, I said that I was aware of a distinguished officer who had come back from Africa, who knew the state of the depôts there, and who himself had gone to the authorities and warned them. I quite admit that he did not name this disease, and I did not say that he did; but he warned them that mange, glanders, farcy, and other diseases were very prevalent in Africa, and asked whether they could get the horses they required in England without taking those back from Africa. The authorities replied that they could, and he implored them not to have any of these horses back. That was the rumour to which I referred. The noble Earl says that no such information or statement was known at the War Office. I have a private letter which I can show him, and then if he likes he can make inquiries and ascertain whether or not the information is accurate. Then we should like to know what are the military centres where this disease existed. Returns are constantly made with reference to diseases in the country, and the centres are given in order that the people in the district may be more on their guard. I gather that the noble Lord is prepared to grant the Return which my noble friend desires, and, if it is not too late, I should like to ask whether he has any objection to giving the names of the military centres where the disease has broken out. That is really very important from the point of view of securing that proper attention should be given to this serious disease in the country. I am glad my noble friend opposite has given us an assurance that the Board of Agriculture are taking up this matter vigorously, because the disease has certainly not been confined to military centres. I know the Board of Agriculture deal vigorously with matters of this sort, but, although the number of civilian cases is diminishing——

LORD WOLVERTON: There is one case at present.

EARL SPENCER: Still, in view of what my noble friend has said with reference to the uncertainty which prevails as to the incubation of the disease, the danger yet exists amongst us. I, therefore, hope the Board of Agriculture and the military authorities will continue their efforts to exterminate the disease.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): Your Lordships will remember that on two previous occasions, on Questions put by noble Lords opposite, we have discussed the existence of this very serious disease which undoubtedly exists, chiefly in Ireland, and to a certain extent in England. I do not for one moment deprecate such discussions, because they show beyond all doubt a great apprehension that unless it is coped with there is a danger of the disease spreading and doing irreparable damage to our horses in England and in Ireland. But, if I may venture to say so, with all due respect to noble Lords opposite, on each occasion when the matter has been discussed Questions have been put which were not on the Paper, and which consequently it was difficult for the representatives of the Departments concerned to answer off-hand. My noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for War did his utmost to answer the Questions put by the noble Lord opposite, and my noble friend who represents the Board of Agriculture on this occasion proved to your Lordships that the care which has been taken and the endeavours which have been made to repress and exterminate the disease have not been altogether ineffectual. I do not for one moment complain of Questions which arise on the spur of the moment being put; I can only say on behalf of my colleagues that the Board of Agriculture will not relax their efforts either in this country or in Ireland to stamp out this disease, which we all agree is of a most serious character. With regard to the Return asked for, my noble friend who represents the War Office desires me to say that he will communicate with his colleagues and endeavour to place the required information at the disposal of your Lordships.

Earl Spencer.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I do not know whether the noble Marquess thoroughly apprehended the Question of my noble friend Earl Spencer. My noble friend wanted to know whether there would be given the names of the military centres from which the disease spread. He thought it very desirable that that information should be given in order that it might be known whence there was a danger of the disease arising.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: Perhaps I did not make myself very clear, I meant to say that in the Return would be included the information which I understood my noble friend opposite to ask for.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: We can certainly give a Return showing the depots at which the cases occurred, but I do not know whether we can say where the disease spread from.

LORD BURGHCLERE: Will the representative of the Board of Agriculture inform me whether the inspectors of the Department traced the civilian outbreaks, and to whom they traced them? What I want to arrive at is how the disease spread.

LORD WOLVERTON: I shall be happy to reply if my noble friend will put a Question down to that effect.

LORD BURGHCLERE: Certainly.

DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 1 to 3, to leave out the words 'or anyone holding the commission of the peace of the borough or county in which the alleged habitual drunkard resides.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2:—

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 21 to 23, to leave out the words, or 'anyone holding the commission of the peace of the borough or county in which the alleged habitual drunkard resides.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4:—

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 10 agreed to.

Clause 11:—

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 39, after the word 'month' to insert the words 'Provided that no person shall be liable to conviction under this section unless the Court is satisfied that he knew, or ought to have known, the drunken condition of the person in respect of whom the charge is brought.'"—(*The Marquess of Londonderry.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 11, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 12, agreed to.

Clause 13:—

LORD LUDLOW moved to omit the words, "and, save when a defendant, a compellable." He pointed out that Clause 13 made husband and wife not only competent, but compellable witnesses in the cases dealt with by the Bill, but he hardly knew what exactly was meant by the words he proposed to omit.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 8, to leave out the words, 'and, save when a defendant, a compellable.'"—(*Lord Ludlow.*)

THE EARL OF MAYO said the promoters of the Bill thought that unless the wife was compelled to attend as a witness it would be impossible to get evidence that the husband had done away with the goods and chattels in the house. There was no doubt a feeling against the proposal, and the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack had expressed the opinion that it might break up the home.

LORD LUDLOW said the noble Earl had not explained the words "save when a defendant."

THE EARL OF MAYO said that, to speak frankly, he did not know what the words, "save when a defendant" meant, but he knew that the meaning of the clause was that the promoters wished the wife to be compelled to give evidence against her husband, and he was aware that there was an objection to that. As to the words referred to, the noble Lord, being a lawyer, probably understood their meaning much better than he did.

LORD LUDLOW said that, although a lawyer, he did not know what was meant by the words "save where a defendant"; they were absolutely unintelligible to his mind. As regarded the clause generally, he objected to make husband and wife compellable witnesses, especially for some of the offences under the Bill. Undoubtedly if the wife were called, a conviction might be secured if she spoke the truth, but it was not a pleasant position for the wife to be placed in. On the other hand, if she did not speak the truth, she might be indicted for perjury and sent to prison. That also was very undesirable in connection with such cases. There were very few offences under English law in connection with which husband and wife were compellable witnesses. In the Criminal Evidence Act, 1898, it was particularly stated that although husband and wife were competent witnesses, the Judge could not compel them to give evidence of any communication which had taken place between them. Again, only last year, in the Cruelty to Children Act, husband and wife were made competent, but not compellable, witnesses. In cases under that Act it might be most important that the wife should be compelled to give evidence, but the Lord Chief Justice, who introduced the Bill, evidently thought it undesirable to include such a provision. He strongly objected to the precedent which such an enactment would set up.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY) entirely supported what the noble Lord had said. Such a provision would be contrary to a generally recognised principle of English criminal law, and he thought it would be extremely undesirable to introduce it in the measure under consideration. He hoped the Amendment would be accepted.

THE EARL OF MAYO said that after the statement of the noble and learned Lord he could not do otherwise than accept the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 14 agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 144.)

SHIPOWNERS' NEGLIGENCE (REMEDIES) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

LORD LUDLOW said he desired to move an Amendment to meet the views expressed by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Heneage) on a previous occasion in reference to Sub-section (4) of Clause 1. The object of the Bill was to give the employee a remedy against the shipowner; it did not change the law, but simply gave effect to the law by preventing the shipmaster sailing away and leaving the employee without anybody against whom he could bring an action. Under the present Act the employee could bring an action against either his immediate employer or the shipowner. The Amendment provided that if the employee brought the action against his employer, the employer should have the same remedies against the shipowner as the employee would have had; he would be able to arrest the ship. The Amendment was practically agreed, and he would simply move.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 16 to 25, to leave out Sub-section (4), and to insert '(4) the words "person applying" in this section shall include an employer who has paid compensation or against whom a claim for compensation has been made under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, as amended by any subsequent enactment, if he shows the Judge that he probably is or will become entitled to be indemnified under that Act, and in such case this section shall apply as if the employer were the person claiming damages in respect of personal injuries.'"—(*Lord Ludlow.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 145.)

House adjourned at five minutes before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 17th July, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:— Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

CANALS (No. 2) BILL (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred pursuant to the Order of the House of the 10th July, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Canals (No. 2) Bill.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT (1868) AMENDMENT (VINCENT SQUARE) BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred pursuant to the Order of the House of the 13th July, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have not been complied with, viz.:—Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment (Vincent Square) Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Thames Conservancy Bill. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [Lords]; Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways Bill [Lords]; Rhymney and Aber Valley Gas and Water Company Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill; Worcestershire County Council (Bridges) Bill, without Amendment.

Skegness Water Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Tees Valley Water Board Bill [Lords]; Whitby Urban District Council Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for granting the use of Schoolrooms for Public Meetings." [Public Meetings (Facilities) Bill [Lords.]

PETITION.

CHURCHES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kirkcaldy, for alterations; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).

Copy presented, of Further Papers regarding the Administration of the Army in India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th July; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 242.]

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 11th July, 1905, constituting Burntisland a Port of Registry for British Sea Fishing Boats [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

WINTER ASSIZES ACTS, 1876 AND 1877.

Copy presented, of Seven Orders in Council of 11th July, 1905, relating to the ensuing Winter Assizes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876, AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACTS.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 11th July, 1905, varying the Order in Council of 25th March, 1877, relating to

Day Industrial Schools [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL PRISONERS REMOVAL ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 11th July, 1905, applying The Colonial Prisoners Removal Act, 1884, to the East Africa Protectorate [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (ENGLAND).

Copy presented, of Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Registrar-General, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (ENGLAND).

Copy presented, of Supplement to the Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Registrar-General, Part I. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (ENGLAND).

Copy presented, of Supplement to the Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Registrar-General, Part II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report to the Local Government Board for Scotland on the Sanitary Condition of the Island of Lewis [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GROSS DEPARTMENTAL EXPENDITURE.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 4th May; *Mr. Gibson Bowles*]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3437 to 3439 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

The Liverpool Dock Strike—Smoking by Workmen.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade, is he aware that the regulations to prevent the use of naked lights and the use of matches and prohibition of tobacco smoking, for the prevention of fire and the protection of property from fire on the Liverpool Dock Estate, are being broken with the knowledge of the local police and other authorities by the workmen imported to take the place of local workmen in the Toxteth Dock; and, seeing that the imported workmen under the protection of the local police are daily and nightly allowed to smoke in the sheds where cargo of an inflammable nature is being stored and handled by the imported workmen, will he take the necessary measures in the interest of property and public safety to prevent an outbreak of fire.

(*Answered by Mr. Bonar Law.*) I have been in communication with the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, who inform me that the workmen in question were taken to the Harrington, not the Toxteth, Dock, and that the firm to whom that dock is appropriated were duly informed by the harbour master that the ordinary regulations as regards smoking must be observed, although he had given permission for the use of two small cooking stoves which have been placed in approved positions and are properly watched. There is no inflammable or other cargo in the shed where the men are located. The Mersey Docks and Harbour Board state that it is very difficult to prevent all smoking when bodies of men are temporarily located on their estate, but that the sheds occupied by them are not on such occasions used as either transit sheds or warehouses, smoking amongst men when handling cargo being absolutely unheard of. They assure me that they and the police are fully alive to the necessity of protecting property on their estate from fire, and that they are doing, and will do, all that is necessary with this object.

Steam and Compressed Air Syrens round the Coast of the United Kingdom.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether any of the syrens on the coast are worked by means of steam; and, if not, will he furnish a statement showing the relative cost of the machinery necessary for producing sound from a syren by means of steam or compressed air.

(*Answered by Mr. Bonar Law.*) The sirens round the coast of the United Kingdom are sounded by compressed air. At the electric light stations, where steam power is available, it is utilised for compressing the air for the fog signals, and steam is also used for the same purpose on board eight of the Trinity House light vessels. At all other fog signal stations caloric or oil-engines are the motive power. In a Report by a special Committee of the Trinity House, which carried out certain experiments with sound-producing instruments in 1901, it is stated that "although many large steam whistles are in operation on the American coasts, there are none in use in the British lighthouse service, they having been regarded as wasteful and inefficient instruments, requiring a high pressure of steam, and radiating the sound equally in all directions vertically as well as horizontally." I am unable to furnish the comparison of cost referred to in the latter part of the Question.

Hyde Park Demonstration on 9th July—Delay to Traffic.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the holding up of the traffic at Hyde Park Corner on Sunday July 9th, in order to give passage to the demonstrators in favour of the Unemployed Workmen's Bill, was of considerably longer duration than usual on such occasions; and whether steps can be taken in the future to prevent such an interference with the convenience of the general public for the benefit of one particular section of it.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The passage through the streets of so large a body of demonstrators must of necessity obstruct general traffic. The police took the measures which they considered would be most effective in mitigating inconvenience to the public, and I am informed that the time during which traffic was stopped at Hyde Park Corner was not much longer than is usually the case in such circumstances.

Pottery Manufacture—Leadless Glaze.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what number of manufacturers are now using a glaze conforming to the standard laid down in Rule 2, as fixed by Lord James's Award; and how these numbers compare with those of the four previous years.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) There are fifty-six factories, out of the 476 coming under the special rules, which use glazes conforming to the standard laid down by Rule 2. Thirteen of these use leadless glazes only, nine use leadless glazes in part, two use only glazes containing 2 per cent. of lead or under, twenty-six use only glazes containing 5 per cent. or under, and six use galena. The only figures available as to the use of such glazes before the new rules came into operation in March, 1904, are the numbers of occupiers who applied for and obtained exemptions, as provided by the 1901 rules, from certain provisions on the ground of using glazes which were leadless or contained only a limited amount of lead. The number of occupiers to whom such exemptions were granted during the two years 1902 and 1903 were as follows: in respect of the use of leadless glazes, nineteen and twenty-two; in respect of the use of glazes containing 2 per cent. of lead or under, one and one; in respect of the use of 5 per cent. of lead or under, fourteen and thirteen.

Deaths from Accidents in Mines.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether there is any instruction of the Home Office to inspectors of mines not to take official cognisance of fatal accidents if an interval of a year and a day has elapsed between the date of the accident and the date of death; if so, whether such a rule prevents the attendance of the inspectors, unless specially summoned, at the inquests in cases of this kind, besides introducing inaccuracy into the statistics of mortality in mines; and whether he will instruct the inspectors of mines, and, if necessary, the inspectors of factories and workshops also, that the interval of a year and a day should affect their action only where a criminal charge is involved.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) For the purposes of the mining statistics the inspectors are instructed to include as fatal all accidents which result in death within a year and a day. Some limit of time is required, and the limit adopted corresponds with that under the criminal law in regard to murder. The rule has been in force for many years, and the number of cases that would be excluded by it would be too few to affect the statistics appreciably. The rule does not apply to the attendance of the inspector at the inquest, or prevent him taking official cognisance of the matter. In most cases, however, the accident will already have been reported to, and dealt with by, him as a non-fatal accident.

Fees of Public Vaccinators.

Mr. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he proposes to issue an Order giving effect to the recommendations of the Departmental Committee which sat to consider the fees payable to public vaccinators; and, if so, when the Order is to be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The Local Government Board have not at present arrived at a decision upon the recommendations of the Committee. Effect could only be partially given to them by means of an order.

Parliamentary Constituencies.

Mr. TOULMIN (Bury, Lancashire): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will present a Return of the Parliamentary constituencies of the United Kingdom, showing the whole of the constituencies arranged in counties, each borough being placed next in order to the county or division of a county in which it is included; showing the population and Members of each constituency and of each county, including together borough and county division, or each section of a county where a county has been treated as more than one unit, as in North and North-East Lancashire and the Ridings of Yorkshire, and indicating by appropriate marks or type those constituencies affected, and how, by the Redistribution Resolutions of the Government; and, also, a complete list of the individual constituencies of the United Kingdom, with the population of each, arranged in order of number of the population, indicating by an appropriate sign or special type each constituency where the number of Members is reduced, or, in the case of counties, where the constituency is part of a county the number of Members of which is reduced by the Government proposals, and also by another appropriate sign or type where the number of Members is increased.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I propose to-day lay on the Table a statement which will in substance include the particulars to which the hon. Member refers in the earlier part of the Question. As regards the latter part, viz., that which relates to a complete list of individual constituencies, if the hon. Member thinks fit to move for this as a Return the matter will receive consideration.

Lisburn Postal Service—Promotion of Local Men.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a postman from Sligo postal district was lately brought to fill a vacancy at Lambeg in Lisburn district, although there were fully qualified men in Lisburn district; and whether, seeing that a local man carried out temporarily the duties of postman in the district for six months prior to the appointment of the Sligo postman to the satisfaction of the residents in the district, steps will be taken to insure that local men will be selected in preference to strangers.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am aware of the transfer referred to in the hon. Member's Question. The man transferred from the Sligo district to the Lisburn district is an established postman, and it is considered that men already holding established positions have a prior claim to temporary men or outsiders.

Reinstatement of Orphans of late Thomas Durkan on the O'Conor (Floghena) Estate, County Mayo.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the O'Conor (Floghena) Estate, situated near Charlestown, county Mayo, has recently been sold to the tenants under the Act of 1903; and whether, as no provision has been made for the reinstatement of the orphans of the late Thomas Durkan, evicted tenant, the Estates Commissioners or the Congested Districts Board will, in view of the circumstances surrounding this case, be instructed to provide for these orphans a farm equivalent in value to that from which their parents were evicted.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) Proceedings for the sale of this estate have recently been instituted before the Estates Commissioners, who will, in due course, consider an application for reinstatement which they have received from Thomas Durkan's representative. If reinstatement is found impossible, the question of providing another holding will be considered.

Untenanted Land on the Armstrong Estate, County Sligo.

MR. O'DOWD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Armstrong Estate, in Achenry, county Sligo, recently purchased by the Congested Districts Board, includes some 400 acres of untenanted land; that the tenants of this estate agreed to the terms of sale giving 24¾ years purchase to the landlord in the belief that these waste lands would be utilised for the enlargement of their uneconomic holdings; and will he say whether the Congested Districts Board contemplate bringing in persons from other counties and giving them these lands; and, if so, whether, as this course would mean the perpetuation of congestion in Achenry, inquiries will be instituted with the view of first satisfying local wants and requirements before carrying out any scheme of migration.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The tenants on this estate have not at any time agreed to a price for their holdings, either with or without the untenanted land. The Board intend to enlarge the small holdings, and to utilise the remainder of the land for the benefit of the small landowners in the adjacent congested districts. If any land remains, the claims of other land holders in the locality will be considered.

Irish Transit Rate for Coal.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that it costs 25s. 4d. per ton to load Irish coal from Castlecomer at Kingsbridge, Dublin, whilst Wigan can be delivered at 16s. per ton, this disadvantage to trade caused entirely by the transit rates in Ireland will receive the consideration of the Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The Department will make inquiry into this matter, which had not previously been brought to their notice.

Arterial Drainage in Ireland.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has yet settled the terms of reference to the Commissioners who are to investigate the defects and necessities of arterial drainage in Ireland; and will he state the names of the Commissioners and the terms of reference.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I do not expect to be in a position to make any statement in this matter for some time. The terms of reference cannot be announced until the Commission has been constituted.

Imprisonment for Debt in Ceylon.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware of the inconvenience attending the existing practice of imprisonment for debt in Ceylon; and whether he will consider the expediency of causing the law to be amended in this respect, especially as regards its application to the estate population of that colony, in view of the fact that such an alteration of the law would afford these Indian immigrants more adequate protection from the exactions of the chetty, or native money-lender.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have no information as to the working of the system, but I will ask the Governor of Ceylon for a report.

Canadian Preferential Tariff for South African Wine.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that Canada proposes to give South Africa a preference on wine of 1s. per gallon; and if he will urge upon this Government to grant a similar preference.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The Canadian Government agreed in February last to submit to Parliament legislation remitting the *ad valorem* duty on all Cape wines not exceeding 40 per cent. of proof spirit. A communication on the subject has been received from the Ministers of the Cape Colony, but the subject is not one with which the Government can deal during the present Parliament.

Assistant Clerks in the Government Service.

Mr. BUTCHER (York): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that there are many assistant clerks (new class) with an average of nine years established service, and in some cases with a total service of fourteen years, who are now in receipt of salaries of between £83 and £85 per annum only, whereas new entrants to the class after similar service will receive £100 per annum; and whether he proposes to take steps to remedy this inequality by giving partial retrospective effect to the recent scheme.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I am not prepared to give any retrospective effect to the new scheme.

Salary and Overtime of Assistant Clerks in Government Service.

Mr. NANNETTI: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of his statement that assistant clerks of six years service receive an increased rate of overtime, and of the Treasury regulations providing that only such clerks as are in receipt of £85 or over receive this increased rate, it is understood that all assistant clerks are entitled to a salary of £85 after six years of approved service; and, if so, will the regulations be amended to include this provision.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I fear that the statement, to which the hon. Member refers, may have been misleading. The assistant clerks I had in mind were new entrants on the scale lately introduced. The reply to the two points now raised is in the negative.

Mr. NANNETTI: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what advantage assistant clerks of over six and less than nine years service derive from the new scheme in offices where overtime is not required.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The terms of the Treasury circular are quite clear, and I cannot undertake to explain how particular sections of the assistant clerks are affected by its provisions.

Mr. NANNETTI: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that there are at present assistant clerks (new class) of nine years permanent service on salaries of £85 a year and under who are married; and whether, in view of the fact that a number of these officers obtained no benefit whatever from the new regulations, he will, following the precedent of the special age pay granted to postal officials, consider the question of granting similar advantages to assistant clerks who are married, or have reached a marriageable age.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to the hon. and gallant Member for Newington on the 15th instant†.

Mr. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will take steps to remove the disadvantage placed upon certain assistant clerks who, in consequence of the adjustment of incremental dates entailed by the Treasury reply to their petition, will be in receipt of a lower rate of pay for overtime than they would have been in receipt of had their incremental date remained unaltered, the proportionate increment of salary received under that reply leaving their salaries for part of a year slightly less than the amount (£85 or £100, as the case may be) to be reached before the higher rate of overtime become payable.

---

† See page 555.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The Treasury circular benefited the class of assistant clerks as a whole; and if any disadvantage such as that mentioned accrues to a few, it must be infinitesimal, and I am not prepared to reopen the question.

France and Germany and the Conference relative to Morocco — Anglo-French Convention.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, as one of the principles on which France and Germany have agreed to take part in the conference relative to Morocco is economic liberty without any inequality, this is understood to imply the open door for foreign trade; and whether His Majesty's Government will, in conformity with that principle, suggest the revision of the Convention between France and Britain, so far as it arranges for the monopoly of the trade of Morocco by France at the end of thirty years.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) There can be no question of revising the Anglo-French Declaration, and if the hon. Member will refer to the text of that document he will see that it makes no arrangement such as he describes.

Chinese Labour in British North Borneo.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state the number of Chinese coolies engaged by the British North Borneo Company's coolie contractor each year since the company's charter was granted; the terms of their engagement; the annual rate of mortality; and the number sent back each year to their own country under the terms of the contract.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) His Majesty's Government understand that no coolie contractor is employed by the company.

Tax in Quebec on Commercial Travellers and Agents for Firms outside Canada.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether the Government of Quebec have recently imposed a tax of 300 dollars on all commercial travellers and advertising agents for firms not having a place of business in Canada; and, if so, whether representations will be made by our Government to have the disadvantage removed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have not yet seen the Act of the Quebec Legislature referred to by the hon. Member, but I have asked the Governor-General of Canada to send me a copy of the Act, together with a report of the circumstances in which it was passed.

Pay of Southampton Telegraph Clerks and Sorters.

MR. TANKERVILLE CHAMBERLAYNE (Southampton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will consider the question of raising the maximum salary of the telegraph clerks at Southampton, in accordance with the regulations governing the classification of telegraphic offices.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I have received a petition from the overseers (formerly designated "clerks") at Southampton for higher pay, and I informed them about four months ago that I am unable to comply with their request. I am considering a memorial from the sorting clerks and telegraphists at Southampton for a higher scale, and my decision will be announced to the staff in due course.

Leicestershire Schools—Exclusion of Children under Five Years of Age.

SIR CHARLES McLAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the resolution of the Leicestershire Education Committee to exclude from the public elementary schools in the county from 1st January next all children under five years of age in rural districts and all children under five years of age in such urban districts as the general purposes committee may deem to come within the category of unfitness on physical grounds to attend school under that age; and whether, until the new Education Code takes legal effect, it will authorise the payment to the Leicestershire Education Committee of grants for infants at 22s. a head (as in the case of older children) in place of the payment of 17s. per head, the present rate, in order to compensate the county to some extent for the financial loss involved by raising the school age from three to five years.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Board have been informed of the resolution referred to in the Question. The Board have no power under the present code to pay grant for infants at 22s. instead of 17s., beyond the power given by Article 31a (ii) to do so in cases where the average attendance of the infant division does not exceed twenty. The hon. Baronet is under a misapprehension in supposing that the new Code will give any increased power in this direction. The Article will remain exactly as before.

Temporary Alteration of School Time-Table.

MR. ERNEST GRAY: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, in the event of the organisation of a school being temporarily disturbed by the illness of teachers, visit of inspector, or similar causes, the time-table of the school may be departed from, providing that an entry of the change be made in the log book, notwithstanding the provision contained in Article 7 (b) of the Education Code, 1905–6.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) In such cases as are referred to by the hon. Member, where it is not possible to obtain previous sanction, the inspector should be at once informed of the alteration, and the departure from the arrangements of the time-table should not be continued without approval.

Watford Grammar School.

MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that the Hertfordshire County Council propose to add to the Watford Grammar School, which is a denominational foundation, a building for the girls' department at a cost of £15,000 to the rates; and whether, seeing that the income of the existing school not being sufficient to maintain it without a county council grant, the whole cost of maintenance of the girls' department, as well as the building, will be defrayed out of public money, the Board of Education have taken any steps to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants of Watford; and whether the Board have sanctioned the proposal of the county council.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) I have received deputations from the Watford and District Free Church Council and from a public meeting which was convened in Watford, and the Board are now in communication with the governors and the local education authority on the subject. The matter is still under consideration.

Motor Boat "Pioneer"—Suggested Call at Wick.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Lord-Advocate whether he will give instructions that the experimental motor boat "Pioneer" shall call at Wick as soon as possible, with the object of showing to the fishermen there the advantages of the motor-driven boat.

(*Answered by Mr. Scott Dickson.*) The Secretary for Scotland has arranged for the motor fishing boat "Pioneer" to follow the herring fishing, and she will visit Wick in due course.

Issue of Midwifery Orders by Relieving Officers.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that in some cases difficulty has arisen from poor women being unable to obtain assistance in their confinements in consequence of unregistered midwives having been warned not to attend such cases, and no others being available; and whether, under these circumstances, he will issue an Order pointing out to the boards of guardians the duty of the relieving officers to grant midwifery orders to women destitute of the means of procuring medical attendance.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) No case of the kind referred to has been brought to my notice. If the hon. Member is aware of any such cases, and will furnish me with particulars of them, I will cause inquiry to be made and will consider what action should be taken.

Motor-Cars on the Continent.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will lay upon the Table of the House Papers showing the laws, rules, and regulations in force with regard to motor-cars in France, Germany, Spain, Italy, and Switzerland, together with any available official information as to the number of motor-cars in those countries, and the number of accidents which have happened within the past twelve months.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I contemplate that the Royal Commission will make inquiry as to the law and practice in relation to motor-cars in the principal foreign countries, and obtain any available information as to the experience of those countries. I think it will be best to leave the matter to them.

Presence of British Admiral at a Spanish Bull Fight.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the attention of the Admiralty has been drawn to the presence on the 9th instant of the Admiral in command of the Mediterranean Fleet, with his officers, at a bull fight in Spain, at which the first bull is stated to have been killed in honour of the Admiral, who thereupon shook hands with the matador and presented him with a sum of £20; and whether these proceedings had or have the approval of the First Lord of the Admiralty.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The Admiralty have no information on this subject beyond what has appeared in the public Press. The £20, if paid as stated, would not be a charge upon the public funds.

Station Sergeants of the Dublin Metropolitan Police.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will arrange that station sergeants in the Dublin Metropolitan Police shall wear numbers on their collars when on duty, as is done by the ordinary members of the force.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) Station sergeants, who are few in number, wear a distinctive uniform, and can be easily identified at any time. There appears to be no reason why they should wear numbers as suggested.

Length of Service of Chief Inspector of Gymnasia.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the present length of service of the Chief Inspector of Gymnasia; and whether his service has been extended beyond the age limit.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold Forster.*) Colonel Hon. J. S. Napier joined the service on the 14th August, 1867. His service in his appointment expires in August next, and he reaches the age limit in November.

East Ham Education Difficulty.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he wrote or caused to be written at some time a letter declaring his intention to introduce legislation or by some other means to give financial assistance to the education authority of East Ham; and, if so, what steps he now proposes to take.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) As I informed the hon. Gentleman on 5th June,† I have made no promise of legislation. I duly received the deputation of which I spoke in my Answer of that date. The deputation laid before me a very elaborate scheme of relief, and that scheme, in accordance with my promise to the deputation, is being carefully considered by the Departments concerned.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxlvii., 722.

I am very anxious to find some means of meeting the difficulty; but great care is required for so delicate and difficult a problem, and time must be allowed before a detailed or final Answer can be given.

Irish Act of Union and the Redistribution Proposals.

MR. O'DOWD: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, seeing that the Redistribution Resolutions contemplated by the Government amount to a violation of the Treaty of Union under which Ireland is guaranteed a certain number of seats, he will consider the advisability of introducing a Bill for the repeal of the Act of Union on an early date.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) No, Sir, I cannot consider the hon. Member's suggestion.

The Unemployed Bill.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is willing to meet in conference the Labour Members of the House with a view to an understanding in regard to the conditions upon which he believes there is a possibility of passing the Unemployed Bill during the present session.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The hon. Member's Question was in substance answered by me to-day in the House in reply to a Question of similar import.

The Unemployed Bill—Suggested Autumn Session.

MR. TANKERVILLE CHAMBERLAYNE: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, if it should be found impossible to proceed with the Unemployed Bill this session, he will consider the advisability of calling Parliament together in the autumn, so that the relief provided in the Bill may be available during next winter.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I have every reason to hope that negotiations which are proceeding for a modification of the Bill will prove successful. I cannot concur in the proposal which he hon. Member recommends.

Trawling in Scotch Waters.

MR. HARMSWORTH: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the evidence recently laid before the Departmental Committee on the Sea Fisheries of Sutherland and Caithness, as to the injury and damage caused by trawling to the white fishing and the herring fishing in the Moray Firth and the Pentland Firth, the Government will appoint a special Commission to inquire into the whole question of trawling.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am advised that while the International Inquiry into the whole question of fish supply in the North Sea is proceeding there would seem to be no sufficient reason for the appointment of a special Commission to inquire into the question of trawling.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Seamen's Debts.

MR. McFADDEN (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he received some time ago a request from Mr. Bernard C. M'Elhinnery, Rathmullan, county Donegal, asking for the address of a man named John Thomas Bell, employed in His Majesty's service, on the ground that he was indebted to the said Mr. M'Elhinnery for the rent of a house due whilst stationed at Rathmullan, in order that he might sue Bell for his debt; whether the request was refused on the ground that there was a rule prohibiting the supplying of such information; and whether steps will be taken to alter this rule, so that facilities may be given to creditors in the position of Mr. M'Elhinnery to ascertain the address of persons in His Majesty's service who evade payment of their just debts.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LEE, Fareham, Hants): This application was refused as it is contrary to Admiralty practice to furnish information respecting the whereabouts of men serving in the Royal Navy, except for the satisfaction of relatives, or for the furtherance of some public object. This practice is based on the provision in the Naval Discipline Act which protects seamen against arrest for debts incurred whilst in the service.

Proposed Reduction of the Volunteers.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that the number of efficient Volunteers, as stated in the annual Return, is 244,537, he can state by what method and within what time it is proposed to eliminate the 64,537 efficients so as to reduce the total force to 180,000.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield): In the absence of my right hon. friend I will read his Answers to the Questions addressed to him. Until reports have been received from the general officers commanding as to the condition of the Volunteer corps in their commands, it is impossible to say whether there will be any, and if so, what reductions in the numbers of the Volunteers. I have already explained to the House that the figure named is that which will allow of the additional grants which I think necessary being made to the Volunteers. I do not anticipate any considerable diminution of the Volunteer force until the incidence of the capitation grant has been altered in such a way as to enable commanding officers to get rid of unfit men, without thereby impairing the financial condition of the corps under their command.

MAJOR SEELY: Will the hon. Gentleman tell us at what time it is proposed to reduce the Volunteers to 180,000 men? Will he give us a date?

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: The information which has been asked for in the circular recently issued will, presumably, be in the War Office by October 31st, the date named in the circular. When that circular has been replied to my right hon. friend will be in a position to judge what further action is required.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E): May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether the information there asked for, being for active service abroad, is to be taken as the standard of efficiency?

No Answer being forthcoming,

MR. McCRAE said: It is most important, Sir, that we should have an Answer.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Question is one of which notice should be given.

Volunteer Musketry Efficiency.

MR. M'CRAE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state which standard of musketry efficiency in the Volunteer Regulations, 1901, will be taken as equivalent to first-class shot in order to comply with paragraph 4, Army Council Circular Letter of July 11th, 1905.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: In the case of Volunteers who have not carried out the present course as laid down in Musketry Regulations of 1903, but have fired that contained in Appendix VIII. Volunteer Regulations, 1901, the equivalent to a first-class shot will be held to be the obtaining of not less than fifty-five points in the last course performed (individual practices).

The Conference with Volunteer Officers.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War by whom the commanding officers invited to confer with him on questions relating to the Volunteer force are being selected; and if he will consider the expediency of leaving the nomination of the delegation to the Institute of the Commanding Officers of Volunteers.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: The general officers commanding in chief have been requested to make arrangements for the attendance of representative officers commanding Volunteer battalions. It is not proposed to interfere with their discretion in the selection of those officers.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: How is a general officer to select them?

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: That is left entirely to his discretion.

The Medical Examination of Volunteers.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if, having regard to the amount of time that would be required for the medical and dental examination of the Volunteer force for active service demanded by his recent circular, and to the paucity of medical officers and the calls upon their professional time, he will authorise a fee of 5s. to be paid for such examination or the equivalent honorarium for the examination of a recruit for the Army by a civil practitioner; and, further, if the Volunteers themselves will be reimbursed their expenses in travelling to and from the medical and dental centre.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: As the Secretary of State stated in reply to a Question put last Wednesday †, there is no reason to suppose that the service will appreciably add to the expenditure of Volunteer corps, and it is not proposed to grant any special allowance. The matter, however, is receiving consideration.

MR. McCRAE: Seeing that this examination is for service abroad is it to be compulsory on all Volunteer battalions?

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: It is compulsory in so far as supplying the information is concerned.

MR. McCRAE: As the Volunteers are enrolled for home service alone, I would ask whether that is in accordance with the Volunteer Regulations?

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT was understood to reply in the affirmative.

Indian Army Administration.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask if the Government are in a position to make any statement as to the decision of the Government of India on the question of military administration which recently arose?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (MR. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The Viceroy has communicated to me by telegraph certain points in connection with the despatch of May 31st on Army administration, on which the Government of India think it necessary to make representations, in order, as they submit, to render the working of the new scheme practicable. I have explained in return that these recommendations do not contravene the provisions of the despatch, and have expressed the satisfaction of His Majesty's Government that Lord Kitchener is now in accord with the Viceroy and his Council as to the course to be adopted with regard to them. The points on which the Viceroy requested assurances were as follows:—(1) That the Member of Council in charge of the Military Supply Department should always be a soldier. His Majesty's Government are prepared to appoint a soldier to the impending vacancy, but they cannot fetter the discretion of the Crown as to future vacancies. (2) That the Military Supply Member should be available for official consultation by the Viceroy on all military questions without distinction. The reply of His Majesty's Government is that there is no desire to fetter the constitutional right of the Viceroy to consult any member of his Council officially or unofficially on any subject, but that the existing system, by which all the Commander-in-Chief's proposals pass to the Viceroy through the channel of the Military Member having been done away with, it follows that no special claim can exist for the Military Supply Member to be consulted or vote on the proposals of the Commander-in-Chief or *vice versa*. (3) That the Secretary to the Government of India in the Army Department (to be in future presided over by the Commander-in-Chief) should be given the local rank of major-general. To this there is no objection. (4) That important changes in military organisation, especially in the native Army, should be discussed by a Mobilisation Committee, of which the Commander-in-Chief and Military Supply Member should be essential members, and that a schedule of cases should be drawn up which the Secretary in the Army Department should submit to the Viceroy before orders are passed on them. These provisions are entirely in accord with the despatch; and His Majesty's Government are glad to find that on this, as on the preceding points, they can meet the views of the Government of India without affecting the principle of the new system which it has been deemed necessary to establish. The telegrams are being laid on the Table.

---

† See page 390.

Morocco Conference.

*MR. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrincham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government have yet received a proposal to enter into a conference with other foreign Governments in regard to the affairs of Morocco; and, if so, whether he can state if such proposal has been accepted, and upon what conditions.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): His Majesty's Government have been asked by the Moorish Government to join in a conference, and we have intimated that, subject to a satisfactory settlement of the programme, and of the time and place of meeting, we shall be prepared to take part in the proceedings.

*MR. DISRAELI: What other foreign Governments besides France and Germany have consented to join and upon what conditions?

EARL PERCY said he was afraid he could not answer at present.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): When will the correspondence be laid?

EARL PERCY: I cannot make any pledge. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will put down a Question.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: It will be laid I take it?

EARL PERCY: I cannot make any promise.

Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the Report for May of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, in which it is stated that the comfort and welfare of some 11,036 children were affected, involving 5,091 offenders, that sentences aggregating forty-two years one month and two days imprisonment were inflicted, and £61 9s. paid in fines, and will he state the nature of the cruelty alleged; and whether the figures include 2,979 children who were insured for £15,348, forty-four of whom met their death.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I have seen the Report referred to by the hon. Member. Particulars of the complaints are given in the Report; and it will be seen from them that the great majority were cases of neglect, starvation, ill-treatment or assaults. I have ascertained that, of the children known to be insured, fourteen died. The figure forty-four represents the total number, among all the cases inquired into by the society, which resulted in death.

Ireland and the Aliens Bill.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in reference to the Aliens Bill, whether he can now state at what ports in Ireland it is proposed to establish immigration officers or boards set up for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The immigration machinery will probably have to be established at Queeenstown or Londonderry. Which of these should be made an immigration port, or whether both should be made immigration ports, must depend on the results of further inquiry, and actual experience of the working of the Act.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): If there is any doubt about Londonderry, I presume there can be none about Queenstown?

[No Answer was returned.]

Accidents to Children in London Streets.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the number of children run over or injured by motor-cars or other vehicles in London; whether he has any official information showing that these accidents often arise from children following street cars and suddenly darting across narrow streets from behind the cars; and, if so, whether he will direct the police authorities to forbid children running after or clinging to street cars, and put up notices to this effect; and whether he can state how many children were killed or injured by street accidents in London last year.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I find that, in the Metropolitan Police district during the year 1904, seventy-one children were killed and 3,500 were injured, out of a total of 155 killed and 10,387 injured among persons of all ages. I fear it is impossible for the police altogether to prevent children from running after or clinging to street cars. They do their best to stop the practice, and frequently intervene, in the exercise of their discretion, to forbid children doing it; but the hon. Member will readily understand that there is often much danger in suddenly warning a child away from a street car to which it is holding. I can only add that everything possible is done to keep down the number of accidents.

Cruelty to Dogs at Lambeth Stairs.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will give orders to the police to prevent cruelty to dogs when they are repeatedly thrown into the water, until exhausted, from Lambeth Stairs.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: Yes, Sir, I am to-day sending instructions to the police to give their attention to this matter, and to be ready to intervene whenever any instance of cruelty at Lambeth Stairs comes under their notice.

Dover and the Immigration Bill.

Mr. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department on what grounds he has not included Dover in the list of immigrant ports under the Aliens Bill.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: Dover has not been included in the list of immigration ports mentioned in the discussions on the Bill, because hitherto the wholesale immigration traffic, against which the Bill is directed, has not come to that port. If circumstances should alter, and show the necessity for so doing, Dover will be made an immigration port. The ports selected in the first instance are those to which this traffic chiefly comes, as shown by the Board of Trade Return, Alien Immigration from Europe, page 39.

Mr. RUNCIMAN further asked as to the views of the Dover Harbour Board, of which the right hon. Gentleman was a Member.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I am not a member of that Board. I have, however, received their views, and I do not think there is any necessity to alter my decision.

Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham): Has the right hon. Gentleman consulted with the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway, of whose opinion he should know something?

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I have before me the returns of aliens and I will give the hon. Gentleman the figures. Taking the average of 1903–4, two years, the following are the number of aliens returned as arriving—at Hull, 67,600; London, 45,000; Grimsby, 37,500; Newhaven, 14,600; Tyne ports, 10,300; Harwich, 8,600; Leith and Grangemouth, 6,500; Southampton, 4,100; against 1,900 at Dover, and as against 3,700 at all the remaining twenty-eight ports at which returns are taken.

Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he was aware that during the last few months, and especially the last few weeks, there had been a great increase in the number of passengers landed at Dover.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I have not seen that, but I will inquire.

Hollesley Bay Labour Colony.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if, in view of the fact that the Government have abandoned the Unemployed Bill, he will state the practical results of the experiment carried out at the labour colony at Hollesley Bay; whether it has been satisfactory; and if it is intended to extend the principle to other localities.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The hon. Member is under a misapprehension in supposing that the Government have abandoned the Unemployed Workmen Bill. They have not given up hope of its being proceeded with. I may, however, point out that information with respect to the labour colony at Hollesley Bay will be found at pages 34 to 37 of the Preliminary Statement prepared by the Central Executive Committee of the London Unemployed Fund, which has been presented to Parliament, and I presume that additional information on the subject will be given in the further Report of the Committee. I understand that the general experience of the colony is regarded as decidedly hopeful.

MR. FLYNN: If the right hon. Gentleman has not abandoned his bantling, will he say to what foundling hospital he has sent his progeny, and where it is to be found.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University): Can the right hon. Gentleman say if Mr. Rider Haggard is to be employed by the Government to inquire into the labour problem or some part of it?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not in a position to answer that.

Secret Commissions Paid by Parliamentary Agents—Action of the Holborn Borough Council.

MR. BENN (Devonport): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to a letter dated July 8th, 1905, from the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Holborn Borough Council, in reference to the secret commission of 33⅓ per cent. paid by Messrs. Bircham and Co., Parliamentary Agents, to Mr. H. C. Jones, late town clerk of Holborn, stating that the money in question was paid as secret commission and not as agency fees; whether he is aware that in consequence of this payment the Holborn Town Council have removed their Parliamentary business from this firm; will he say whether Messrs. Bircham and Co. still retain their appointment as Parliamentary Agents to the Board of Trade; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have received a letter from the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Holborn Borough Council containing a statement to the effect referred to. I have also received an extract from a report by a committee, which was adopted by the borough council, which contains a recommendation to the effect that in future the council should employ for their Parliamentary work outside their offices some firm which has a rule prohibiting its members from making any allowance of the kind in question. The last part of the Question should be addressed to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade.

Motor-Car Act Inquiry.

MR. BROOKE ROBINSON (Dudley): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the inquiry into the working of the Motor-Car Act, 1903, will be open to the public; and whether its scope will enable the Royal Commissioners to consider the position of cottagers and others who, from their dwellings being on the roadside, suffer from the dust occasioned by the present motor-car traffic.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: It will be for the Royal Commission to decide whether their proceedings shall be open to the public or not. The Answer to the latter part of the Question is in the affirmative.

Alien Paupers in England and Wales.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state what was the ratio of alien paupers to the total number of paupers in England and Wales in the latest year for which the figures are available; what was the total cost of Poor Law relief in that year: and what was the cost of Poor Law relief to aliens calculated at that ratio.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The latest figures in my possession as to alien paupers relate to the 1st July, 1903. The ratio of alien paupers to the total number of paupers in England and Wales on that date was about 0·22 per cent. The total cost of Poor Law relief in the year 1903–4 was in round numbers £13,369,500, and the cost of relief to alien paupers calculated on the above ratio would be about £29,000.

SIR WILLIAM TOMLINSON (Preston): Has any estimate been made of the rate of pauperism in those districts which are crowded by aliens?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not in a position to give the figures.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Do I understand the alien pauper represents one in 500?

Govan and the Redistribution Scheme.

MR. HUNTER CRAIG (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board why the municipal borough of Govan, with a population of over 90,000 inhabitants, is not provided with a Member to itself in the Government Redistribution scheme, which provides that all municipal boroughs with a population of 65,000 are entitled to a Member.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: My attention has been called to the case of Govan and I have made inquiry about it. I agree that it should receive separate representation as coming under Paragraph 1 (b) (i) of the Redistribution Resolution. The result will be that the number of Members for the county of Lanark will remain at six as at present.

The Redistribution Scheme.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the fact that by changing 18,500 to 25,000, as the proposed population limit for the disfranchisement of boroughs, and 75,000 to 65,000, as the population limit for the disfranchisement of double Member constituencies, and by providing that no county or borough with more than two Members shall have less Members than the integer obtained by dividing its population by 50,000, the number of the Members of the House will be left unaltered at 670, whilst the English counties of Cornwall, Devon, Lincoln, Norfolk, Somerset, and Wilts would not be deprived of one Member each; and whether, in view of the advantage thus obtained, he would be prepared to amend the Redistribution scheme on the lines indicated.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not think that the proposal of the hon. Member would have the result which he supposes. Its effect would be largely to increase the number of the Members of the House, while, as regards the counties of Lincoln and Norfolk which he mentions, the number of Members in each case would still be diminished by one. The hon. Member's plan would, moreover, involve applying a different minimum to counties and boroughs. I could not undertake to amend the Redistribution scheme on the lines indicated.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Does the right hon. Gentleman consider one man in King's Lynn equal to six and a-half men at Lewisham?

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): Does the Government propose to "jerry-Balfour" the constituencies.

[No Answer was returned.]

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that if the Redistribution scheme is passed as proposed, the counties of Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, Lincoln, Norfolk, and Wilts, with a present population of about 50,000 to every Parliamentary constituency, will be deprived of one Member each, and six small boroughs, with populations averaging about 20,000 each, will retain the privilege of sending a Member to Parliament; and whether such inequalities are intended to be remedied before the Resolution is passed.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am aware that the effect of the scheme would be substantially as stated in the Question, but perhaps I may be allowed to refer the hon. Member to the observations contained in the last paragraph of my Memorandum of July 10th which has been presented to Parliament.

Redistribution—Cost of the Boundary Commissioners.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether provision has been made in the Estimates of the current year for the payment of the Boundary Commissioners proposed to be authorised by the Resolution now before the House.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No specific provision has been made in the Estimates for this purpose. The expenses of the Commission would be defrayed out of the Vote for Temporary Commissions.

Alien Population.

MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade if he can give the figures for 1904 of the total emigration of aliens, not being transmigrants, but who have resided in this country; and can state whether the figure of 75,000 immigrants appearing in the Board of Trade Return represents the increase to the alien population in that year, or whether any deduction should be made from it in respect of such emigration.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. BONAR LAW, Glasgow, Blackfriars): The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. The figure of 75,000 represents the number of aliens recorded as arriving in the United Kingdom from European countries in 1904, after deducting seamen and known transmigrants. The number does not purport to represent the increase in the alien population in the year, since it takes no account of aliens arriving from non-European countries, or of aliens (other than known transmigrants) departing from the United Kingdom, or of deaths among the alien population during the year.

Passenger Rates from the Continent.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade if he will state approximately what is the usual difference between the cost of cabin and the cost of steerage passages from the port of Antwerp or Hamburg to Hull or London.

MR. BONAR LAW: The Board of Trade are informed that in the case of passages to London, the approximate difference between the cost of cabin and steerage passages from Antwerp is 11s., and from Hamburg 11s. 9d. In the case of passages to Hull, the difference in the rates from Antwerp is stated to be 7s. 6d., and from Hamburg 12s.

The United States and Aliens.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade if he will state what was the total number of aliens debarred from landing in the United State, on the ground that they were criminals, in the last five years for which the figures are available; and what was the total number of aliens in the prisons and penitentiaries of the United States at the end of those years.

MR. BONAR LAW: All the information on this subject that the Board of Trade are in a position to give, was given in answer to a Question by the hon. Member on February 22nd†.

Hyde Park, Cleansing of the Carriage Drive.

*MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if he will state what amount of filth and nuisance was removed from the carriage drive in Hyde Park for the months of April, May, and June; what staff is required to attend to this department; what is done with the refuse, and, if sold, what does it realise; and whether, if this nuisance can be diminished, it will add to the comfort and health of those using the park.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Five hundred and forty-six cubic yards of scavenging refuse were removed from the drives in Hyde Park in the three months named. The Office of Works has a staff of sweepers (averaging about twelve), but the actual removal of the refuse is carried out by a contractor, and the Office of Works is not concerned with his disposal of it. Nothing is received for the refuse from the contractor. The First Commissioner does not see what more effective measures can be taken for the carrying out of this service.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 896.

Churches (Scotland) Bill.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether under the Churches (Scotland) Bill the Free Church and the United Free Church will be able to hold the property allocated to them respectively, notwithstanding any alteration that may be made in their constitution or doctrines.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): The Answer to the Question of the hon. and learned Member must obviously depend on the precise alteration and on whether it is permitted by the constitution of the Church making it.

Use of the Truncheon by Irish Policemen.

MR. MULDOON (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to an action brought by one Edward Carroll against Dominick Masterson and Michael Cryan, two members of the Royal Irish Constabulary, in which these defendants were mulcted in £100 damages for striking the plaintiff on the head with their truncheons; and whether his attention has been drawn to the charge to the jury of the learned Judge who tried the case, in which his lordship laid down that a policeman was not justified, except in case of extreme emergency (such as the case of a man rushing at the police with a knife), in using his truncheon on the head of a civilian; and whether, considering the number of occasions upon which the law thus explained has been broken, he will communicate the learned Judge's charge to the constabulary officers and officials in Ireland.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I have read a newspaper report of the charge. It appears to be greatly condensed, and I cannot say whether it is accurate. The learned Judge does not appear to lay down any general rule embracing all cases in which a policeman would be justified in striking a person on the head with his truncheon, but confined himself to one case as an example. The force are fully instructed in the law on the point, and it would not appear to be necessary to further instruct them, even if a full and authentic report of the Judge's remarks were available, which it is not.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire if the report is correct?

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Have the damages been paid in this case?

MR. WALTER LONG: I cannot say.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): As the right hon. Gentleman declines to communicate the learned Judge's decision to the police, will he say under what law they assault the people?

MR. WALTER LONG: I did not decline. What I said was that the police had explicit instructions in this matter, and I saw no reason to add to them.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): In future cases will the right hon. Gentleman take care to ascertain if statements published as to Judges' charges are correct?

MR. WALTER LONG: It seems to me that question does not now arise.

Irish Lord Chancellor's Salary.

MR. MULDOON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in reference to the provision in the Bill to augment the Ireland Development Grant to reduce the salary attached to the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland by £2,000 a year, he could see his way, with the assent of the present Irish Lord Chancellor, to secure that the provision might come into operation on the passing of the Act instead of at the next vacancy in the office, so as to secure the money at once for the object contemplated; and whether he will favourably consider Amendments designed to carry out this object.

MR. WALTER LONG: I cannot undertake to entertain an Amendment of this character.

Assistant Law Adviser of the Irish Local Government Board.

MR. MULDOON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any person, and, if so, who, has been appointed as assistant to the law adviser of the Local Government Board for Ireland, and the date of such appointment, if any, and the salary attached to such appointment.

MR. WALTER LONG: No such appointment has been made.

Constable Masterson, Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what steps were taken to secure the apprehension of Constable Masterson between the date of his disappearance, on the 30th June, and the assizes, on the 5th July, on which date he failed to surrender to his bail; and can he say on what date, and to whom, did the district inspector at Maryborough report Masterson's disappearance.

MR. WALTER LONG: The constable was out on his own recognisances to appear at the assizes and there was no power to apprehend him until he had failed to appear. The fact of his disappearance on 30th June was at once reported by the district inspector to the Inspector-General, and information was circulated to the police at important centres throughout the country. At the assizes a Bench warrant for the constable's arrest was obtained at the first possible moment, and is now in the hands of the police, who have made every effort to arrest the constable, but so far without effect. I have most carefully investigated the whole circumstances, and am satisfied that the suggestion of connivance on the part of the police is absolutely without foundation.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that in future members of the Royal Irish Constabulary on bail against whom a serious charge is pending are no longer permitted to retain their quarters in the police barracks?

MR. WALTER LONG: They will be treated in the future as in the past.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN: Will you grant a sworn inquiry into this case?

MR. WALTER LONG: Certainly not.

MR. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): Did the man go away in uniform or in plain clothes?

MR. WALTER LONG: I cannot say.

MR. DELANY: Why did the County Court Judge accept this man's personal security?

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Because he wanted him to bolt.

Promotion in the Irish Agricultural Department.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the increases of salary that have been granted to certain officials of the Irish Agricultural Department, some of whom had not been two years in the Department's service, will he state what was the latest recommendation made to the Treasury on behalf of the clerks transferred from the Veterinary Department to the new Department who have now eleven years service and only £97 10s. a year, and who will have served twenty-six years before they become entitled to 15s. a week pension.

MR. WALTER LONG: Any recommendations which may have been made to the Treasury are of a confidential character, and I can give no information on the subject.

Lisnemaine, County Cavan, Evicted Tenant.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Patrick McConnell, the evicted tenant of a farm in Lisnemaine, county Cavan; whether, as the landlord alleges, the Estates Commissioners are responsible for causing unnecessary delay in reinstating the said tenant; if not, who is; and, further, when will possession likely be given.

MR. WALTER LONG: Proceedings for the sale of the estate concerned were only instituted in December. The agreements for purchase include one signed by Patrick McConnell. The estate will be inspected in order of priority, and in the meantime McConnell's purchase cannot be completed. There has been no unnecessory delay.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants in County Cavan.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of evicted tenants in county Cavan; the number of applications filed for reinstatement; and how many evicted tenants have been actually reinstated, distinguishing between those who were restored to their old homes and those for whom new farms were procured.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Estates Commissioners are unable to answer the first inquiry. Applications for reinstatement have been made by 158 evicted tenants from the county; of these five have been restored to their former holdings, and one has been provided with a farm elsewhere.

Amalgamation of Boys' and Girls' Schools in Ireland.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have taken into their consideration the statement and resolution which the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, with the Cardinal Archbishop of Armagh in the chair, adopted on the 14th ult., in opposition to the policy of amalgamating boys' and girls' schools; and, if so, whether the Commissioners propose to make any modification of the rules to which the Catholic hierarchy have taken objection.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am in communication with the Commissioners in this matter, and will ask the hon. and learned Gentleman to repeat the Question on Wednesday.

Dublin Police Report.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain the reason for the delay in publishing the annual report of the Chief Commissioner of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, and state when it will be published.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am inquiring into the reasons for the delay. The report, I understand, will be circulated at once.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants by the Estates Commissioners.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of evicted tenants reinstated by the direct action of the Estates Commissioners, and give the names and numbers for each county where such reinstatements have been effected, and the assistance granted to each evicted tenant by the Commissioners.

MR. WALTER LONG: This information is being prepared, and will be communicated to the hon. Member.

The Irish Land Judge's Court.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant the Return in reference to the Land Judge's Court on the Paper for this day.

MR. WALTER LONG: Yes, Sir, the Return will be granted.

Appended is the Return referred to—

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Land Judge's Court (Ireland).—Return, by counties, of the Estates in the Land Judge's Court over which Receivers have been appointed (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 182, of Session 1904).

Land Purchase at Abbeyfeale, County Limerick.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of tenants in the parish of Abbeyfeale, in the county of Limerick, who have purchased their holdings under the Land Purchase Acts previous to the Land Act, 1903; how many have purchased, or arranged to purchase, under the latter Act; can he say whether there are any tenant farmers in that parish who have not purchased their holdings; and, if so, how many.

MR. WALTER LONG: The records of the Land Commission are kept according to counties, and not according to parishes. Information as to county Limerick under the first two heads of the Question will be found in the last Annual Report of the Land Commission. The third inquiry cannot be answered.

Crime in County Limerick.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state in how many cases within the past two years white gloves have been presented to the County Court Judge of Limerick; and whether he is aware that at the last criminal sessions His Honour stated that the county was in a most peaceable condition.

MR. WALTER LONG: On six occasions within the past two years. The Judge is reported in the Press to have used language to the effect mentioned. His remarks would appear to have had reference to the county as a whole, and not to any particular district of it.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a statement made by Judge Kenny, in his address to the grand jury at Limerick Assizes, on the information of the county inspector of constabulary, that in certain districts in the county of Limerick comprising portions of Abbeyfeale and Newcastle West agrarian outrages were on the increase, and that since last assizes five additional persons had to be placed under police protection; if he will state the names and number of such persons, and the reason for their protection, having regard to the fact that nearly all the land in the parish of Abbeyfeale has been purchased under the Land Purchase Acts, and that there was no crime of an agrarian character before the Judge.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg further to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a statement made by the Rev. Father Casey, parish priest of Abbeyfeale, at a meeting of the United Irish League there, in referring to Judge Kenny's charge to the grand jury at Limerick Assizes, in which he associated that district with crime, that he did not know of any man within ten miles of Abbeyfeale under police protection, and that his parishioners conducted their business without recourse to violence of any kind; and whether, under these circumstances, he will say if any statistics were supplied by the constabulary authorities to the Judge; and, if so, whether he will supply them to the House.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Judge of Assize and the Rev. Mr. Casey are reported in the Press to have used language to the effect mentioned in these two Questions respectively. The Judge's statement was entirely accurate. Of the five persons referred to in that statement, some were examined as witnesses for the Crown in a moonlighting case in which criminals were brought to justice, others are relatives of those witnesses, and one is suspected of having given information. These persons do not reside in the parish of Abbeyfeale. They are under police protection because it is believed that their connection with this prosecution has placed their lives and property in danger. To give their names or fuller information with regard to them might increase that danger, and I must respectfully decline to give it.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: What was the nature of the moonlighting case?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I think that was an attack on a house.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Can you answer the last part of my Question as to statistics?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I imagine the statistics were supplied in the ordinary way.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Will you give me further information as to this matter? I think I am entitled to it as a Member for the county.

Mr. WALTER LONG: I have said that if I were to give further information it might increase the danger in which these people are, and I am not inclined to do that.

North of Ireland Postal Service.

Mr. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he has recently received copies of resolutions passed by the urban councils of Dungannon, Omagh, Cookstown, Strabane, and Armagh in favour of an evening postal service *via* Greenore and Holyhead, whereby an extension of two hours would be given to all towns lying between Londonderry and Greenore for posting their English letters; and whether, in the interests of Ulster generally, he will consider the desirability of establishing such service.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Many of the local authorities in the North of Ireland have applied to me for a service to England by way of Greenore, and only last week I received an influential deputation on the subject. I am now making further inquiry as to the possibility of meeting their wishes, and I will in due course communicate my decision to the hon. Member.

Cookstown Telephone Arrangements.

Mr. DOOGAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General has he received a copy of a resolution, passed unanimously on the 3rd instant by the Cookstown Urban District Council, expressing disappointment that no step has yet been taken to construct the line of telephone between Cookstown, Dungannon, Omagh, and Belfast, notwithstanding that a line is being constructed to connect certain towns in the counties of Derry and Antrim with Belfast, which line will be longer, more expensive, and for fewer subscribers than the line proposed for the Tyrone towns; and, having regard to this resolution and previous correspondence with the Postmaster-General, and in view of the fact that it would be only fair that the people of Tyrone should receive equal treatment to that accorded to their neighbours in Derry and Antrim, can he now say when steps will be taken to have the line constructed.

Lord STANLEY: I have received the resolution referred to and am giving the subject careful consideration. I should be quite willing at once to extend the telephone system to the Tyrone towns in question, if there were as many persons in them willing to rent telephones as there are telephone subscribers in Derry and Antrim.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: But did not a return sent to the noble Lord last year show more prospective subscribers?

Lord STANLEY: No, Sir.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: It is the case, though.

Late Letters for the Limerick Night Mail.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the fact that persons desiring to post late letters at the night mail leaving Limerick have been refused entrance to the railway station by the officials of the railway company, although showing the letters; and whether he will have representations made to the company to facilitate the posting of late letters at the station.

Lord STANLEY: My attention has been called to this matter. I should perhaps explain that the public are only allowed to go on railway platforms to post letters by favour of the railway company, and that it is of course always open to a company to refuse that favour. As only passengers are now allowed on the platform at Limerick Station, I have given instructions for the letter box in front of the booking office which is accessible to the public at all times to be cleared a few minutes before the time of despatch of the mail trains in order that it may be used for late-fee letters for the mail.

Wiltshire and the Redistribution Scheme.

MR. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that there are at present in the county of Wilts five county constituencies with an average population of over 50,000 each; that there is in the same county a borough with a population of 19,421, as returned by the census of 1901; and that the proposals of the President of the Local Government Board entail the disfranchisement of one county seat, representing an average population of over 50,000, and the retention of the borough as a Parliamentary constituency with its population of 19,421; and if, under these circumstances, he will reconsider the Redistribution proposals of the Government in so far as they affect the county of Wilts.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): As I think the hon. Gentleman will see, there is no possible principle to be laid down, short of equal electoral areas, which will not produce, or rather I ought to say leave, in a diminished form some anomalies. The Government are clearly averse from the principle of equal electoral districts, which as far as I know has never found any favour with responsible statesmen on either side of the House, and the hon. Gentleman, therefore, must not make it a matter of reproach that anomalies exist under the scheme we have submitted.

Ireland and the Redistribution Bill.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the fact that at the passing of the Reform Act of 1832 the population of Ireland entitled that country to 261 Members, and that a demand for an increase in the Irish representation to that figure was rejected by the British Parliament on the ground that the Act of Union fixed the Irish representation for ever at the present figure; whether he is aware that the Ministers of the time and both English Parties insisted that the Act of Union was a treaty between Great Britain and Ireland, and could not be altered unless by consent of both parties; and whether he can state on what grounds it is proposed to make population the test when the population has declined, seeing that this Parliament refused to accept that test when the Irish population had largely increased.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Such information as I have in my possession does not lead me to believe that the hon. Gentleman is accurate in his statement in the first portion of his Question, but he may have been able to give a more detailed examination to the debates of 1831–32 than I have been able. I have not come across the statement to which he refers. As regards the original arrangement in the Act of Union, the representation of Ireland appears, as far as it can be made out, to have been fixed upon the double consideration of taxable value and population. ["Oh."] I may be wrong.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: You are.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understood that view was common property. I do not know how that would work out on the present occasion. It is not my business to make the necessary inquiries, and it is not the plan on which the Government propose to proceed.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is not aware that Mr. Stanley, in dealing with this subject in reference to the Reform Act of 1832, refused to increase the number of Irish Members, or to take into consideration the increase of population, because he argued that Ireland was estopped from asking more having accepted the figure of 100 in the Act of Union.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It is possible; if the hon. Gentleman has seen that reference, I have no doubt it is accurate. I have come across some *obiter dicta* of independent Members of that time, but not any authoritative statement of the then Government which bears out the contention in the Question. But I do not wish to assert a negative; if the hon. Gentleman knows it, I quite accept his statement.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Might I most respectfully suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that before he seriously proposes to interfere with the representation of Ireland he ought to make himself acquainted with the facts?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Gentleman does me, quite unconsciously, some injustice. I have made myself acquainted with the fact that all the provisions of the Act of Union relating to the representation of Ireland's counties and boroughs, or almost all, have been violated, chiefly by those with whom he acts.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I made a respectful suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman that he ought to have made himself acquainted with the facts: is he entitled in answer to that suggestion to make an argumentative statement?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: On the point of order, Sir, may I ask whether, when I am reproached with ignorance——

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: You admitted it.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: With ignorance of the fundamental considerations that ought to govern the conduct of the House in this matter, I am to be debarred from stating and proving that I had adequate knowledge as regards the matter in hand.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in view of the difference of opinion which exists on this question, he will not consider the propriety of publishing, as a Parliamentary Paper, first, the Act of Union, and secondly, the brief debate, for such it was, which took place in 1832 on the question of the Irish representation.

*Mr. SPEAKER: That question does not arise out of this.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Mr. Stanley, who made this declaration, was Chief Secretary for Ireland, and subsequently became Lord Derby? As it was an official declaration on the part of the Government, will the right hon. Gentleman circulate that speech?

*Mr. SPEAKER: That also does not arise out of the Question on the Paper.

Sir GEORGE BARTLEY (Islington, N.): Is it not the fact that the result of the Union with Ireland for the first thirty years of the last century was largely to increase the population of Ireland?

[No Answer was returned.]

The Unemployed Bill.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if, having regard to the number of unemployed in Sheffield and the district in the winter and to the increasing importation of staple goods they used formerly to make, he will indicate, in view of the exigencies of next winter, what portions of the Unemployed Bill can be regarded as uncontentious, and drop the remainder.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: My right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board is, I believe, in communication with Gentlemen on both sides of the House; and I have great hopes that there may be a common desire to agree upon a Bill which should be, if not universally approved, at all events sufficiently in conformity with the general view of the House as to be practically uncontentious.

The Redistribution Resolutions.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask you whether you are now in a position to give a ruling with reference to the point of procedure to which I took the liberty of calling your attention last Thursday—namely, whether it would be in accordance with the rules of procedure and of precedent to take the Redistribution Resolution as one Resolution, or whether it ought not, as has been done in similar cases, to be submitted to a Committee of the House?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: May I also ask you, Mr. Speaker, to give your ruling as to my point of order—namely, whether, when a Resolution contains various different propositions, it should not be divided, and each proposition put separately?

*MR. SPEAKER: I have had an opportunity of taking into consideration all the points that were raised on Thursday last; and I have come to the conclusion that to offer the Resolution which stands in the name of the President of the Local Government Board and to take it in the ordinary way—that is, *en bloc*—after the first Amendment has been disposed of, would not afford to the House a sufficient and adequate opportunity for discussing the various matters and principles which are contained in that Resolution. I think, therefore, the Resolution ought to be divided into at least eight, and probably nine, Resolutions. When that point is reached I have further to consider whether, in taking a series of Resolutions like these, eight or nine in number, the proper procedure is that they should be taken *seriatim* by the House with myself in the Chair, or whether they should be referred to a Committee. It may be said that the old system of referring these Resolutions to a Committee of the Whole House is obsolete. The last time in which it was employed, I think, was about the year 1868. But I cannot undertake myself to say that a system of that kind has become obsolete in the course of less than forty years. The question then arises — How are these Resolutions to be dealt with? The form of proposing these Resolutions, although not obsolete, is antiquated; but I feel I am driven back when this form is adopted to follow former precedents; and, looking at almost the last precedent—the year 1867, when Mr. Disraeli introduced his Reform Resolutions, which were somewhat of this character, partly for the extension of the franchise, and partly for redistribution of seats, which numbered some thirteen, I find that the procedure then adopted was to set up a Committee of the Whole House and to refer these Resolutions to that Committee, where they would, in the ordinary course, have been discussed. It so happened that on that particular occasion they were not discussed, because another method of procedure was adopted, and the principles set out in the Resolution were embodied in a Bill. But that does not concern the House on the present occasion. What really does concern the House is, what the procedure then adopted was; and the procedure was, as I say, to set up a Committee and refer these Resolutions to it. [AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: A Committee of the Whole House?] Yes, certainly, a Committee of the Whole House. That was the same procedure as was adopted in 1858 upon the Resolutions relating to the Government of India; and those two precedents seem to me to be strictly in force, and I cannot take upon myself to set aside those precedents on this occasion. I can only repeat what I said on Thursday as to the precedent of the Irish Church Resolutions, which I do not think is for our guidance, and so need not be considered on this occasion; for, by reason of a certain Standing Order then in existence, all matters dealing with religion were, by that Order, referred to a Committee. But, following the precedents of 1858 and 1867, my opinion is that these Resolutions ought to be divided, and, when divided, that they ought to be considered by a Committee of the Whole House.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: May I, Sir, after that statement, ask the Prime Minister what course he proposes to ask the House to adopt to-morrow, or on subsequent days, in reference to this matter?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It must be perfectly evident to every Member of the House who has listened to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, that unless the two sides of the House come to some agreement as to the length of time to be occupied in these discussions, an agreement which, of course, in view of the pressure of other business upon us, would not involve a very large expenditure of Parliamentary time, I cannot go on with them; and as no suggestion has reached me that any such agreement is likely to be considered, as, indeed, it was openly derided by the hon. Gentleman who has put the Question to me, I propose to found my course upon the same precedent as you, Mr. Speaker, have founded your ruling; and, as Mr. Disraeli in 1867 withdrew his Resolutions and proceeded with his Bill, I mean to withdraw my Resolution and proceed with my Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Does the right hon. Gentleman mean to proceed by Bill during the present session?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, no!

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I would ask the right hon. Gentleman what, then, will be the course of business this week?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose to proceed with the Committee on the Scottish Churches Bill to-morrow and until that stage of the Bill is finished. I hope to be able to take the preliminary stages of the Naval Works Bill during the next few days, so as to take the Second Reading of that Bill on Friday.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What Supply will be taken on Thursday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Irish Supply.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Colonial Vote is greatly in arrears, and the right hon. Gentleman promised a day for the discussion of the new Constitution of the Transvaal.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I said that the proper time for the discussion of the Transvaal Constitution was on the Colonial Vote, and if the right hon. Gentleman desires I will put that Vote down for Thursday week.

MR. BUCHANAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the usual three extra days for Supply?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think that is a very unlikely contingency.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: May I ask whether, as the right hon. Gentleman has withdrawn the Redistribution Resolution, he will consider the advisability of giving some of the available time to the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that he does not propose to give the usual three extra days to Supply?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I said it was an improbable contingency; and I am sure that, if the right hon. Gentleman has listened to the passionate appeals which have been made to me with regard to the legislative projects of the Government, he would not press me for them.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Surely the Resolution upon Redistribution being out of the way makes a difference in the prospects of Supply?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The withdrawal of that Resolution may facilitate the progress of various important Bills; but I do not think it makes it easier to find time for all the things about which I am pressed by both sides of the House.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Will the right hon. Gentleman now proceed with the Sale of Butter Bill?

[No Answer was returned.]

Motions for Adjournment for Holidays.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury can he now say when he proposes to make the Motion whereof notice was given by him three months ago, and which now stands in his name on the Order-book, with reference to adjournments; and can he state whether he intends to make it this session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have on several occasions indicated to the House that if the proposal were to be treated as uncontentious I would move it, but I have received no assurance from hon. Gentlemen opposite that it would be so treated.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: On the last occasion I raised this question the right hon. Gentleman promised to consider if my Amendment were not uncontentious.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman may rest assured that the substance of the Resolution is generally approved. We say it ought to be carried a good deal further.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: And therefore it becomes a question of the acceptance of my Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I certainly cannot accept my hon. friend's Amendment nor do I understand it would be treated as non-contentious. I may be mistaken, but I understand the right hon. Gentleman opposite to say that whether the Motion be in the form in which it appears on the Paper or whether in the form my hon. friend desires to see it voted, it would not meet the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite, who hold that a much more extensive change is required.

Business of the House—Suggested Autumn Session.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will arrange to prolong the session until at least the Unemployed Bill and the Workmen's Compensation Bill are carried into law; and whether, in the event of this being impracticable, he will call together Parliament early in the autumn to secure the passing of the Unemployed Bill in time to enable local authorities to take any necessary action under it before the winter.

MR. CHANNING: I beg also to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware of, and has considered, the repeated declarations of Judges and magistrates, that changes of the law in the sense of the proposals of the Prevention of Corruption Bill and the Betting Bill are urgently necessary to check grave commercial and social evils; whether he is aware that the organised temptations to betting, offered to women and children as well as to men, and leading to habitual gambling and frequently to crime, are greatly on the increase in populous centres, and that sporting mid-day editions of newspapers are now being circulated gratuitously to all employees at certain large works in towns like Manchester; and whether he will consider the advisability of devoting part of the remainder of the session to useful and urgent legislation of this type.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am very anxious that the Workmen's Compensation Bill should pass. I am not aware that it will require much discussion. It is another matter, however, to ask that there should be an autumn session to discuss that Bill, the Prevention of Corruption Bill, and the Betting Bill. That is a self-denying proposal which will not meet with universal approval even on the hon. Member's own side of the House, and certainly not of the House generally.

MR. CHANNING: Does the right hon. Gentleman prefer to pass his Redistribution Bill to measures of great social importance——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is an argumentative question.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Henry Liddell, esquire, for the County of Down (West Down Division).

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 273.]

PUBLIC MEETINGS (FACILITIES) BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 274.]

DOGS (PROTECTION) BILL.

Second Reading upon Monday, 31st July.

CARTS (IRELAND) BILL.

"To provide for the use of Irish characters in the names of owners painted on carts," presented by Mr. Boland; supported by Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. Lundon, and Mr. O'Malley; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 275.]

RELIEF OF RELEASED PRISONERS BILL.

"To make better provision as to the relief of Persons released from Prison," presented by Major Seely; supported by Sir Barrington Simeon; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 276.]

ALIENS BILL.

As amended, considered.

Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) moved to omit Clause 1. He thought the House might very well consider at this stage whether it was wise to put on the Statute-book of this country a provision which obviously was not meant to be adequately carried out by the Government and which cast upon shippers and shipping companies the expense of an operation which was intended for the benefit of the nation. That was, he submitted, an unfair principle to go upon. This clause was meant, they were told, for the purpose of keeping out what were described as undesirable aliens, but the opposition to it was on the ground that it set up a poverty test. In his opinion no case had been made out for the exclusion of the aliens. Conditions might arise in which it would be necessary to protect ourselves against a huge immigration, but those conditions had not arisen yet. The number of pauper aliens in comparison with the total alien population was only one-fourth the number of British paupers as compared with the British population, and, therefore, so far from alien paupers being supported by the Britisher, the alien ratepayer made a grant in aid towards the support of British paupers. They had been informed during Questions that day that the total cost of alien paupers to this country was £29,000 per annum, and the Home Secretary estimated that his Bill would involve an annual outlay of £24,000. He feared, however, it would cost the taxpayer far more than it would save him. Though he admitted the Bill had been altered for the better, it still did not protect the victims of religious persecution, and he argued that it was not right to cast on shipowners a charge which, if borne at all, should be borne by the nation.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 6, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. Emmott.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'elsewhere,' in line 11, stand part of the Bill."

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) said he could not accept the Amendment. He maintained the necessity of excluding undesirable aliens, and, in so far as a certain onus was thrown on the shipowners, said he was assured by the shipowners themselves, including the hon. Member for Grimsby, who had a practical acquaintance with the matter that the cost would be infinitesimal. It must be remembered that the provision allowing the examination to be made on shore at the scheduled ports was a concession to the shipowners, who undertook, if it were granted, to raise no difficulty with regard to the cost, while the burden, such as it was, would make them more careful in regard to the kind of immigrants whom they brought to these shores. He could not admit that the hon. Member in his sympathy for the shipowner had shown any good reason for the omission of the clause. It was not unfair to ask the shipowner, who presumably made a profit by bringing aliens to this country, to pay any extra cost which might be incurred. He hoped that under these circumstances the hon. Member would not press his Motion to a division.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said that as the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary desired to postpone what he had to submit on the religious question he would say nothing about it now. But he must observe that when the Home Secretary told them that buildings already existed, were they to understand that they existed in such a way as to be capable of being used as practicable places of public detention. There might be places in which immigrants could be put up for the night, but it must be remembered that it was part of the plan of the Government that they should be kept as prisoners, and that it should be an offence for which they could be punished and brought back for them to try to escape. Would the right hon. Gentleman tell them whether these places were what they called "lock-ups;" that they were to be under police supervision and where immigrants could be kept as prisoners in such a way as to prevent them trying to escape? He wished to have some information upon this subject. The right hon. Gentleman said that the view of the Opposition was that they ought not to exclude entry, but that they ought to exclude persons who were proved to be criminals, and that the view of the Government was that they ought not only to expel the criminal but that they ought to prevent the criminal and every other person considered undesirable from coming in.

He would recall the points on which the right hon. Gentleman had entirely failed to give any satisfaction in answer to the criticisms they had made. First of all they had had no evidence of the gravity of the evil, no statistics entitled to any credence had been given to them with regard to the number of aliens who came here to stay. In the next place, the right hon. Gentleman had never met their argument that they could not exclude aliens without doing wrong to a large number of innocent people. It had never been shown that the aliens who would be excluded under this Bill would be those who were guilty of the two offences charged under the Bill, viz., that they injured British trade or that they became chargeable on the rates. What had been shown was that the Jews provided for the poor members of their own community, and that the bringing in of a great deal of Jewish labour enabled a number of trades to be established which could not flourish without cheap labour in their initial stages. That was a point on which they had repeatedly asked for information which they had never had. Further, the Home Secretary had been obliged to admit that he could not exclude aliens coming in in batches of under twenty and that the steamboat companies would practically be able to bring about all the evils of which he complained. Again, the right hon. Gentleman had never attempted to show that there were any means whatever by which the Bill would reduce the number of criminal aliens who entered. The Bill applied only to steerage passengers, and it would not exclude the most dangerous classes—the expert pick-pocket and the women whom they all desired to exclude, but who did not come in as steerage passengers. Therefore, as far as they were concerned, the Bill was a mere sham. Consequently, he was obliged to ask the Home Secretary whether he would at this stage, or on some of the Amendments, endeavour to give some Answer to the criticisms they had repeatedly made on the Bill, and whether he would endeavour to show in the first place that the evils were real; and in the second place, if they were proved to be real, whether the Bill would do anything to reduce them. Until that were done, they would be compelled to regard the Bill as one merely brought in to meet a political cry to which the Party opposite had lent themselves.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 228; Noes, 132. (Division List No. 285.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. SirH.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F.(Middlesex
Bowles, T.Gibson(King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn J.A.(Worc.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon.SirJosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFred.Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt.Hn. Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Rt.HnAilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch,Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, RtHnSirR.B.(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'r H'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, Walford D.(Wednesbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, SirJames(Staffords NW.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John(Kent,Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd, Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hon. Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn. H.L. W. (MileEnd
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Liddell, Henry
Llewllyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(EdinburghW.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hon.Sir FrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,David J.(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. HonChas Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Roberts, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, SirH. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, HC.(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,RtHnJ.Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirC.AH.(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, RtHn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph Allen
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt EC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt, Hon. Sir Henry
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W
Lambert, George
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Morley, Rt.Hn.John(Montrose)
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, JohnLawson(Leeds,S.)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James, (Galloway)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Emmott and Mr. Noel Buxton.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said that recently he had had an opportunity of conferring with the Cunard Company and other companies in Liverpool upon whom the burden of carrying out this Act would largely fall. He wished to state that these companies fully appreciated the conciliatory spirit which the Home Secretary had displayed in reference to this Bill as regarded the difficulties of the shipping interest, and recognised that he had largely met their wishes and endeavoured to remedy the practical difficulties they had raised. There were, however, one or two points in which the Bill would press very hardly upon them. One of those points was as to providing a place ashore where the immigrants were to be inspected. As this was a matter for the public convenience it should be defrayed at the cost of the public. The offence of importing an undesirable alien was an offence entirely created by this Bill. Where an Act was passed which threw upon a particular industry the burden of carrying out a certain service in the public interest, it was the duty of the State to make it as little burdensome as possible, and the State ought to bear the expense. That was the object of the Amendment he desired to move.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not see how the hon. Member's speech is relevant.

*Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR said his Amendment was to insert the words "and provide."

*Mr. SPEAKER: That would be casting an additional burden upon the State, and it cannot be done upon the Report stage.

*Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR said the expense of carrying out the Act was thrown upon the State, and he wished to know whether he was wrong in arguing that the providing of accommodation ought to be made a part of the expense of carrying out the Act.

*Mr. SPEAKER: That would be placing a greater charge upon the public funds than has been imposed by the Committee. The House cannot now add to the charges imposed by the Committee.

*Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR said he would omit the words "and provide," and move, in line 11, to omit the word "elsewhere" and substitute "at such other convenient place in the discretion of the immigration officer as he may appoint." As the clause stood at present inspection might take place elsewhere than on the ship, but it was not stated who was to appoint this place. According to the view of the Home Secretary each shipping company would have to arrange its own place. The Cunard Company might have one place, the White Star Line another, and the Allan Line another, and each company would have to provide under the Act a place of inspection for immigrants. He thought that such places ought to be provided by the authorities entrusted with the administration of the Act. He begged to move.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 11, to leave out the word 'elsewhere' and insert the words 'at such other convenient place in the discretion of the immigration officer as he may appoint.'"—(*Mr. Charles McArthur.*)—instead thereof:—

Question proposed, "That the word 'elsewhere' stand part of the Bill.'"

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) thought it was desirable that these inquiries should be made in some public place or Court where the public had access, so that there would be no hole-and-corner proceedings. These proceedings would partake of the nature of a trial upon matters which might affect a man's fortune, and he wished to ask either the Home Secretary or the Attorney-General whether it would not be desirable on Sub-section 1 of Clause 2 to provide that these inquiries should be held in a public Court or place. What he wanted to suggest was whether they would not consider whether it would not be desirable to put in some words whereby the friends of the immigrants and the public Press could have access in order that the proceedings should not be of a hole-and-corner description.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he thought the word "elsewhere" should be left out. It wanted some definition or explanation. The Bill, as originally drafted, provided that the examination should take place on the ship. The word "elsewhere" was an extraordinary one, and he should be glad if the Home Secretary would explain where the Government actually meant that the examination should take place. There was no particular reason why they should be enamoured of the Amendment, for it was moved by a shipowner, and they were very suspicious that shipowners wanted to throw the expense on the State; but it was a little better than the Bill itself, because it provided that the first duty was to fix the place of examination, in which case the point of the noble Lord would be secured, for everybody would then know that the examination would take place at that particular place. The Government must have some plan in their mind, and he would be glad if they would tell them, in order that they might understand how the Bill would act, and where, when, and under what circumstances the examination would take place. As the Bill stood, nobody knew.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he did not think there was any doubt about the word "elsewhere," and, if he remembered rightly, it was accepted at the instance of the shipowners. It was perfectly clear that the original intention was that the inspection should take place on the ship, but, as a concession, they agreed that it should be held elsewhere, in buildings to be provided at the cost not of the State but of the shipowners. It was welcomed by the shipowners as preferable to examination where it might interfere with the discharge of the cargo. Now the hon. Member for Liverpool asked them to delete the word "elsewhere" and insert "at such other convenient place in the discretion of the immigration officer as he may appoint," and he was going on when it was pointed out that it would involve additional cost to the State. The concession of inspection on land was asked for by the shipowners, and, surely, if the shipowner made a profit, as he undoubtedly did, it was not unreasonable that he should be asked to pay something in the event of incoming aliens being a charge. At all events, if there were a charge, they could not expect it to fall upon the State. The noble Lord was very anxious that the inquiries should be held in a public Court or in some place to which the public could obtain access and hear the whole inquiry. That was entirely a different view to that held in America, where the inquiry was private; and he ventured to think that it would be very undesirable for the aliens to have the whole world there to publish their affairs, and that they would themselves desire that the inquiry should be held without reporters present. He therefore hoped that as his hon. friend had found that he could not obtain his desire and cast the extra cost upon the State he would not press his Amendment, because he was sure the words in the Bill were fully calculated to carry out the whole desire of the promoters.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said he had listened to the extraordinary speech of the Home Secretary, and he hoped the hon. Gentleman who moved would go to a division. He was quite surprised to hear that the Home Secretary thought it might be in the interest of the shipowners that the reporters should be present.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he did not say that. He said the alien, coming into this country and having to disclose his past history and his means, would probably prefer that the reporters should not be present.

Mr. DALZIEL said the right hon. Gentleman had not in any previous period of the progress of the Bill shown any anxiety for the alien, and he would suggest that this was a late stage at which to take up his case. It was not the interest of the alien they had to consider in this matter; when the right hon. Gentleman said that no reporters should be present, he must remember that the whole of the interest of the public was at stake. He therefore thought it was a most extraordinary position for the Government to take up, to say that one reason why the Amendment should be rejected was that reporters might be present and that that would be against the interest of the parties associated in the matter. That showed more than anything what really was the mind of the Government as to the working of the measure. Their idea was that it would be an entirely hole-and-corner matter. The public would not be admitted, the representatives of the Press would not be admitted, and it would be quite impossible for them to have any authentic details as to the proceedings. The whole thing would undoubtedly be secret, and they would simply have to take the Returns of the Home Secretary as to what took place. He knew the right hon. Gentleman did not want to make any Party capital out of carrying a matter of this kind, and he would really suggest to him whether he was not going a little further than the promoters intended, and appeal to him whether he would not reconsider the statement he had made and provide for the inquiries being public. If the Amendment were accepted, it did not go nearly as far as he wished, but he thought, from the shipping point of view, it was an important Amendment, because otherwise the inspection might be at a place which was inconvenient both to the passenger and the shipping company. If, however, it were a convenient place and the public or the representatives of the public were not going to be admitted and the matter was to be one of secrecy, he did not think it would be to the credit of the Government or that it would add to the prestige of the Bill.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 227 ; Noes, 142. (Division List No. 286.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Rt Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Rt. Hn Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mdd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir James (Staffords. NW
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. Denbigh
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Liddell, Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux

Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, SirH.(Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, Rt.Hn.JParker(Lanarks
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirC.EH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,N.E.(York,NR,Whitby
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, CaptEC(SAndrw'sBghs.
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel, T (Glamorgan
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mooney, John J.
Morley,Rt.Hon.John(Montrose
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. JohnP(Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
O'Connor, James(Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle ofWight
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Dalziel and Mr. Bright.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 20, to leave out from the word 'that' to the word 'give' in line 21, and insert the words 'leave to land should not be withheld under this Act.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland) moved, on behalf of the hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Whitley), to exempt from the definition of an undesirable alien any person who could show that he would be supported by relatives. There was, he said, no inconsistency in this Amendment with the purposes of the Bill, and it was one which he thought the Government could and ought to accept. As the Bill stood an alien would be excluded if he could not show that he had in his possession or was in a position to obtain the means of decently supporting himself and his dependents, if any. He instanced the case of aliens who had settled in this country either before or after the passing of this Bill, who were permanently established here, and wished to bring over their parents from the country in which they lived. The aged parents might come to the shores of this country but would be met on arrival with the question, "Are you in a position to support yourselves or to obtain the means of decently supporting yourselves?" In all probability they would not be able to work, and would be unable satisfactorily to answer the question. In that case, as he read the Bill, the immigration officer would have no alternative but to exclude them. He could not conceive that the Government desired to inflict such a hardship, and he therefore hoped they would accept the Amendment. It had already been laid down by the Government that a person in receipt of Poor Law relief was not supporting himself within the meaning of the Bill, and the same might possibly be said with regard to persons subsisting on the charity of relatives. To prevent the hardship that might arise from such an interpretation some such words as he proposed should be inserted.

Mr. DALZIEL formally seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 28, after the word 'any,' to insert the words 'or that he will be supported by relatives.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) said he hoped the House would not accept this Amendment. The words, he submitted, were not necessary because if an immigrant was able to show that he would be able to obtain the money from his relatives he obviously showed that he was able to obtain the means of decently supporting himself. The position was covered by those words.

Mr. DALZIEL urged that it was the duty of the House to incorporate in this Bill some such words as those suggested by the Amendment. A question of this kind should not be left to the discretion of the immigration officer, because there was no guarantee as to what the capacity of the officer would be, and therefore it was necessary to put something in the Bill as a direction. He submitted that the Amendment was a useful one and would help the operation of the Bill, and therefore it ought to be accepted.

Mr. EMMOTT asked if this was one of the questions covered by the rules which were to be made by the Home Secretary. It was a small point but an important one, and therefore he thought the House should have some information upon that point.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS was understood to say that for the reasons stated by the hon. and learned Attorney-General these words were unnecessary.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE said he understood the refusal of the hon. and learned Gentleman to accept this Amendment was due to his belief that the introduction of the words would do more harm than good. It was a question of the strict interpretation of the words of the Bill. It was a most important matter, because it raised the question whether under the wording of the Bill as it now stood it would be competent for an immigrant to say that because he had relations able to support him therefore he was in a position to support himself.

Major SEELY (Isle of Wight) expressed the opinion that it would be better to put in some words of this kind in order to avoid confusion in the future. The wording of the Bill had just been interpreted in two different ways, and it was fair to assume that the immigration officers when appointed would not be less wise or more intelligent than the Members of that House. Therefore, in order to prevent the immigration officers interpreting the words differently, it was desirable that some such words should be incorporated in the Bill.

Question put, and negatived.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said the reason for the Amendment which he now moved must be obvious to every Member of the House. Every alien who came into this country with a contract in his pocket guaranteeing him work would be able to satisfy the immigration officer that he was in a position to obtain the means of decently supporting himself out of the contract under which he was brought in. A contract which was intended to endanger and damage the British workman was a passport to every alien, no matter how they came into this country. That was a very serious matter. Let them take the American experience. The first American Bill contained no provision against aliens coming in under contract, and the result was that in Italy, Spain, and other countries agencies were formed, and contractors organised a regular system of sending in batches of people to America under contract, and because they were under contract these men were able to enter America free and unchallenged. The American Senate, therefore, had to amend the aliens law by introducing a contract clause to keep out otherwise desirable people who came in under contract. He contended that some such Amendment as this must be inserted. If it went abroad that the Government, having introduced this Bill, were not prepared to strengthen it so as to prevent it being used for the purpose of defeating British workmen in the case of a strike or lock-out the feeling, already strong, against this Bill on the part of the British workmen, would be very much accentuated. Individually, he was against the Bill, because he did not think it was workable in its present form. If it was desired that it should be operative the Government must amend it on the lines indicated by the Amendment. Working men when striking for better conditions of employment found it was already sufficiently difficult in competing with the surplus labour of the unemployed at home, but if in addition they were to be threatened with the importation of foreigners their position would be very much worsened. He remembered two cases where this power had already been used. One was in connection with a dispute which occurred at Glengarnock Ironworks in Ayrshire. Some years ago when the labourers who were receiving 14s. a week asked for an increase of 1s., the manager asked for time to consider their request, and a fortnight subsequently fourteen or fifteen Poles put in an appearance, having come under contract at the old rate of 14s., and when the deputation again approached the manager to ask for his reply he pointed to these foreigners and said, "If you don't take the 14s. there are plenty more of these men who would only be too glad to come." If this was the sort of thing they were going to set up under this Bill it was time to stop it. The argument on a former occasion was that the position of workmen in this country would not, in the matter of foreign labour, be worsened under this Bill. But he would respectfully suggest that their position must be worsened under the Bill. All sorts of evasions would be attempted to circumvent the clauses of the Bill, and one of these would certainly be some organisation for bringing workmen into this country under some form of contract which would carry the immigrant beyond the immigration officer. He trusted that in order to protect British workmen who were seeking to improve their condition against undue and unfair competition, the Government would see their way to accept the Amendment. He begged to move.

MR. BELL (Derby) seconded the Amendment. He could hardly conceive that any hon. or right hon. Gentleman in the House would object to the acceptance of the Amendment because the chief reason for the introduction of this Bill was that foreign labour was being imported into this country to replace that of British workmen. If that was the real reason which had influenced the Government in introducing the Bill he was unable to see how they could object to the acceptance of this clause. The workers of this country would very rightly come to the conclusion that if the Bill was introduced with that object it was only reasonable that a clause of this kind should appear in it. He was quite unable to see how the position of the British workmen would be improved if in cases of dispute it was possible to import 100 or 500 aliens. It was a matter of indifference so far as figures were concerned, beyond the fact that the greater the number imported the worse it would be. In regard to the aliens imported at the present time he had not heard a great deal of objection in any part of the country with the exception of one or two constituencies in London. If 100 or 500 foreigners were imported to replace those engaged in a dispute there would be thrown on the labour market here many men who were defending their own position. He could hardly conceive that the Government desired to do that. If the Amendment were not accepted it would create a good deal of bitter feeling against the Bill, the seriousness of which had not yet been recognised by the working men of this country.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 10, at the end, to insert the words '(e) If he is being brought into this country under contract to take the place of workmen during a trade dispute.'"—(*Mr. Keir Hardie.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he could not accept the Amendment. Nothing in connection with the aliens question had received more careful consideration than the matter which the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil had brought forward in an exceedingly able and courteous way. The object of the Amendment was to exclude aliens who were "being brought into this country to take the place of workmen during a trade dispute." He had not heard that such a practice prevailed in this country, but the hon. Member who moved the Amendment had instanced a case where some Poles had been brought here for such a purpose. It certainly had never come to his knowledge.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE said there was another case.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said the Amendment was opposed to the principle of the Bill. The Bill as it stood was intended to exclude aliens who owing to their low standard of living made it likely that they would fall readily into the hands of sweaters. The object of the Bill was also to keep out the alien who was destitute and likely to become a charge on the rates. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil had said that it would be easier under the Bill to obtain foreign indentured labour than at the present moment. He did not think that would be so, because at present employers had absolute freedom to bring in aliens by giving any promise they liked. Certainly, in future an employer would be limited in his action, because he would only be able to bring in those who could pass the tests provided by the Bill as desirable aliens.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said he very much regretted that the right hon. Gentleman could not see his way to accept the Amendment. Apart from the evil which the mover of it had described, it was not unlikely that shipowners, who were subject to certain penalties under the Bill, would find in the possibility of importing contract labour a source of profit which they hoped would make up for the loss of some of the traffic which the Bill would stop. He thought they ought to be guided in this matter in some measure by the experience of the United States of America. He believed that of the immigrants who were refused admission last year something like 20 per cent. desired to enter for the purpose of undertaking contract labour. If that was so, it showed that the restriction upon immigration did have some direct bearing on the question of foreign labour imported under contract. A man might come to this country under a contract made for five months, and at the end of that period he might become a charge on the public rates.

Mr. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid.) said that he and other hon. Members who were present when this subject was discussed before had hoped that the Home Secretary would at this stage of the Bill have drawn a form of words to show that there was some real desire on the part of the Government to strengthen the position of the working classes of this country. But the *non possumus* attitude which the right hon. Gentleman had taken up seemed to have closed the door in that direction. The Home Secretary had made a great deal of the argument that this Bill was for the benefit of the working classes; but, for his own part, he had never been able to see anything in the Bill at all which tended in that direction. If that had been the case there would not have been so much opposition to the Bill on the part of the working classes in the country. There had not been a single demand from the representatives of the working classes, inside or outside the House, for this Bill; and there had been no tendency on the part of the working classes themselves in that direction.

To take the Bill as it stood, and the interpretation of it by the Home Secretary, its principle was to keep out undesirable aliens. But would the word "undesirable" include a man who was brought to this country to take the place of a man on strike? He knew that long ago workmen used to strike without much thought. But now they negotiated with their employers and tried to arrange matters; and if they were forced to strike the sure inference was that they wanted to better their condition. That was the economic truth as to the existing relations between employer and employed. But this Bill left open the opportunity of workmen being brought from the Continent to take the place of men on strike. He was not charging the employers of this country as a whole that they would use this Bill, if it became law, for that purpose, or that they would use alien labour for the purpose of sweating and reducing the wages of the workmen here; but there were men who would use this Bill for the purpose of bringing in pauper labour to supplant the British workmen.

In Sub-section 3, Clause 1, a man was to be considered an undesirable alien who had not in his possession or was not in a position to obtain the means of decently supporting himself and his dependents; and he was therefore to be excluded. But who was to judge the standard of decency in which a man and his family could live? He maintained that a man and his wife and family could be brought up in decency on a wage that was small compared with what hon. Gentlemen, who had a very much larger income, could conceive. But if the man had in his pocket a letter from an employer in this country that he would find employment, according to the Home Secretary, that would be enough to cover the proviso in the sub-section. It would be possible for an employer here to send over to the Continent hundreds of such letters, and when the recipients of these letters came over here and were asked by the immigration officers if they could show that they were in a position to obtain the means of decently supporting themselves and their dependents, all they had got to do was to produce such a letter from any employer in some part of Great Britain. It might be said that that had never been done; but they all knew that, human nature being what it was, advantage would be taken by a certain class of employers of the avenues which were opened to them. This Bill opened up such an avenue.

He could have wished that before this Bill was introduced some sort of consensus of opinion on the part of the people had been taken in favour of it. They had had quite a number of measures introduced by this Government of which the public had had no idea beforehand. This Bill would disturb the whole economic relations between employers and workmen in this country. It would exclude men who came over here, impelled by honest poverty, to seek employment; while it would be an inducement to employers to bring over contract labour from abroad. He asked the Attorney-General to show the House in clear, plain, and obvious terms how the prohibition contained in the Amendment would conflict with the principles of the Bill. The ostensible reason for the Bill was that it was for the benefit of the working classes of this country; but they who claimed to speak for the working classes, held that if this prohibition was not put in the Bill, no matter how large its provisions were to keep out criminals and undesirables, it would not be for the benefit of the working classes.

*MR. MARKS (Kent, Thanet) said that it must be admitted that the practice of importing foreign labour into this country under contract had not in the past been pursued to any large extent. But the conditions with regard to foreign labour were about to undergo a change. Up to the present time alien immigration into this country had been unchecked, unrestricted, and unregulated, with the result that we had always a mass of unemployed foreign labour ready at hand and prepared to take work at any kind of starvation wage. But they expected great results from this Bill and that a large amount of alien immigration would be stopped by it. If the object of the Bill was to be attained—viz., of arresting the importation of foreign cheap labour, that would not be accomplished unless the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman were adopted. All that the employer who wanted to avail himself of the very cheapest labour available had to do would be to supply a pauper alien with a contract of employment thereby removing his disqualification, and thus defeat one of the chief objects of the Bill. If, like the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, he thought the whole Bill a great mistake, he would not, like the hon. Member, seek to strengthen it. He did not believe in strengthening measures that were a mistake. But that was not his view. He believed that this Bill would be greatly for the benefit of the working classes of this country, and that that benefit would be largely extended by the adoption of the Amendment. It was for that reason that he supported the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman.

*MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) thought that the Government had made a mistake in introducing this Bill and foisting it on the country. The ostensible object of the Bill was to prevent the undue competition of aliens with British workmen, and in the constituency which he had represented in that House for many years a small section of the people had been deluded by a bogus organisation, which had been started for that purpose, into the belief that they were seriously affected by pauper alien labour; and that they would be relieved from the difficult position in which they had been placed through want of employment, by the passage of this Bill, a Bill which it was said would prevent employers in the East End of London or any other part of the kingdom from engaging alien workmen. But, supposing a strike or lock-out took place here, any number of shoemakers, tailors, cabinetmakers or other artisans could be introduced from abroad into this country. He might be told that the immigration board would take care that every man who came into this country would be scrutinised very closely and unless he could produce the evidence required by the Bill, that he possessed or was in a position to obtain the means of decently supporting himself and his dependents, he would be returned to the country from which he came. But the sweating class who employed these pauper aliens could easily get over that difficulty. They could get just as many as they pleased, and at any time they pleased, of these poor wretched people from all parts of the Continent of Europe. All they would have to do would be to provide each man or woman with a contract which would be produced to the immigration officer, a contract entered into between the immigrant and the sweating employer who had guaranteed him employment for six, eight, or twelve months.

How were they going, under this Bill, to prevent any such sweating employer from engaging as many pauper aliens as he pleased? There was, however, a body supposed to have a *bona fide* existence, the Free Labourers' Association, and that association, he supposed, might have something to say if there were any attempt on the part of the Government to prevent employers or workmen from entering into a free contract, whether the workmen came from the Continent of Europe or from any part of the United Kingdom. Let them devise whatever they please, it was practically impossible to prevent sweating employers from engaging just as many foreign workmen or women as they pleased, and bringing them over to this country under a contract, the production of which would be sufficient warrant for the immigration board to allow them to pass into any port of the United Kingdom. He believed the Bill was going to prove an absolute and ghastly failure.

He should have thought the Government would by this time have seen the serious mistake they had made in attempting to deal with this evil. It was quite true that there had not been very many instances during a strike when men had been imported from the Continent, but there had been attempts on the part of employers, though fortunately they had failed, the workmen of this country, having friendly relations with the workmen of the Continent, were able to prevent masons, builders, tailors and shoemakers from being imported during labour struggles in this country. It was not for want of will but for want of power that employers had not brought foreign labourers into this country to supplant the British workman when he was endeavouring to better his position. He did not mind that so much, he supposed it was regarded as fair play; they had fought employers in the past and had defeated them. But during a normal condition of things, when there was no struggle, lock-out, or strike, it would be practically impossible, through the agency of the Bill and the machinery it set up, to prevent sweating employers or employers of any kind importing into this country just as many poor people as they pleased to carry on the work in which they were engaged. He believed the Government by this time must have seen the lamentable failure that was likely to be the result of the Bill, and even at this eleventh hour he would advise them to withdraw it.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said that if he remembered rightly the hon. Member who had just sat down was one of those who signed a petition to the Leader of the Opposition not to oppose the Bill, and another hon. Member on the other side had spoken of the evil with which the Bill was to deal. He was glad to hear that they recognised there was an evil.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid.): What I said was that after the explanation of the Home Secretary it would be competent for the sweating employer to send over 100 letters and bring over alien labourers.

SIR GILBERT PARKER, continuing, said he understood, and he was not disagreeing with the Amendment. He was in agreement with it. It helped to strengthen the Bill, and it seems to him that they had had very strong arguments that afternoon in favour of the measure. If the foundations of the Bill were so wrong, then the only right thing was the Amendment. Even then, if it were carried, the Government would have done such a work that the right hon. Baronet. would be obliged to give it his sanction.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I said, if the subject is to be dealt with at all, then this and the seamen who have not been touched are the two branches of it I should be content to deal with.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said that they came back to the conclusion that there were evils, and they believed they were dealt with to some extent by the Bill. They had had that afternoon the clearest and strongest proof of it, for every Member who had spoken had admitted this evil of sweating, and the hon. Member who had just sat down said that his constituents were deeply concerned that a section of the Bill should be carried.

MR. CREMER: What I said was that a section of them had been deluded into the belief that the Bill would benefit them.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said the hon. Member was so deluded himself that he petitioned his leader not to oppose the Bill. It was difficult to ride two horses at once, unless one were very expert. He only rose, however, to say that he wished to support the Amendment. He believed it would strengthen the Bill, and he should be as strongly opposed as any Labour Member to employers taking advantage of industrial crises to import alien labour.

*MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said he agreed that the speech of the hon. Member for Haggerston had some elements of interest in it, and the hon. Member for Gravesend said he was riding two horses at once, but he (Mr. Trevelyan) should say he was beginning to find out that he was putting his money on the wrong horse.

*MR. CREMER: The hon. Member is misrepresenting me. I never favoured this Bill from the first; I wanted it discussed so that we might show the hollow mockery of the whole thing.

*MR. TREVELYAN said he and those opposed to the Bill were very much pleased to hear that that was the only motive which actuated the hon. Member for Haggerston, the hon. Member for Poplar, and some others on that side of the House. There was another speech that ought to interest the Member for Gravesend as a strong supporter of the hon. Member for West Birmingham. The main, and, in fact, the only reason given by the Home Secretary for his opposition to the Amendment was that it was a protective Amendment. He repudiated anything protective in the motive which had induced the Government to bring the Bill forward. It was a curious contradiction of the view of the hon. Member for West Birmingham. But if, in his view, the Amendment had been in any sense protective, he should certainly have refused to support it. He did not like the necessity for any Amendment of the kind, for he thought it would be very much better if they had a system of State arbitration to prevent trade disputes occurring. When a lock-out or strike occurred a state of war ensued between the two parties concerned, and it was the business of the nation as far as possible to keep the field clear. What happened when a number of aliens or free labourers of any kind were introduced was that the employers had the unfair advantage of bringing in what really amounted to contraband of war. It was in order to prevent such an advantage being given to one of the parties that many Members of the House supported this Amendment. He and those who thought with him opposed this Bill because in their opinion it was not necessary to keep out, as a class, aliens, most of whom were a benefit rather than otherwise to this country. But labourers brought in during a strike were not brought in in any sense as permanent citizens. When they had served the turn of the employers in defeating British labour and had cheapened wages they were sent back to the country from whence they came, or turned loose in the slums of our great cities. There was, therefore, a particular reason for the interference of the State in this way. It was to his mind a curious thing that the Government should oppose the one Amendment moved in the interest of labour by the Labour Members.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said the principles of the Bill were perfectly good. The object of the Amendment of the hon. Member opposite was to stop the introduction of cheap labour into this country, but so far as he could see it was of no use to try and stop labour entering this country unless the production of that cheap labour was also stopped.

*MR. CHARLES WILSON (Hull, W.) asked why the Government could not see their way to accept the Amendment. In his twenty years experience as an employer of labour he had never known a case where employers of labour had ever wished to employ foreigners. They had always recognised in the first place that they were of little use, and in the second that their importation always necessitated a further expenditure, because after the strike was over they had to be sent home. He had had some experience of strikes, and in the case of the strike against his own firm twelve years ago it was fought out fairly and squarely, and there had been no strike since. He did not think there had ever been a wish on the part of the employers to import foreign labour, and so far as his experience went no such thing had ever been attempted. The employers of labour did not object to this Amendment, and that being so he could not see why the Home Secretary should not accept it.

Mr. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale) said it was not often he found himself in entire accord with the hon. Member who had just sat down. In the whole of his business experience no such case had ever come under his notice, and he did not believe that such a case would ever arise. His objection to the Amendment was that it was a dishonest Amendment in the first place, and further that it was outside the scope of the Bill. He urged hon. Gentlemen opposite to take a broader view of this question.

*Mr. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) said the observations of the hon. Member appeared to him to cast some reflection upon those who supported this Amendment. Apart from the objection of the Home Secretary that this Amendment was in the nature of a protective Amendment, he also appeared to object to it because he thought it would lower the standard of living. The hon. Member supported the Amendment in the belief it would prevent the standard of living being lowered, and contended that there was no greater method of lowering the standard of living in this country than by allowing large bodies of workpeople to come to this country under contract at the time of a trade dispute. The chief effect would be to drive down wages, and when wages were driven down the standard of living was lowered. It was argued that if these people were brought over at such times that they would ultimately be returned to their own country, but it was equally probable that they would be retained here. Another objection raised by the Home Secretary to the Amendment was that there had been no case where people had been brought into this country under contract during the existence of a strike, but the answer to that was that hitherto it was not necessary for them to have a contract, but under this Bill there were inducements to accept contracts. Workers had in the past come over of their own free will and were taken on in the ordinary course of employment as required. He appealed to the Home Secretary to accept the Amendment, more especially as many on his side of the House who had supported the Bill up to the present supported the Amendment. In his opinion, if the Bill was passed in its present form without this Amendment it would do considerable harm to the workpeople of this country.

Mr. JOHN WILSON (Glasgow, St. Rollox) said he should support the Amendment, not in any spirit of antagonism to the Bill, but because he thought the Amendment was necessary. He hoped the Government would accept it.

Mr. DALZIEL thought the Government would do well to give a favourable consideration to the debate which had taken place. The hon. Member for Liverpool had characterised the Amendment as a dishonest one, and had reflected on Mr. Speaker by stating that it was not within the scope of this Bill. He thought it was a great piece of assumption on the part of the hon. Member to have spoken in the way he had done. In his (Mr. Dalziel's) opinion this was as important and as honest an Amendment as had been moved to the Bill. There was an absolutely unanimous opinion in favour of the Amendment; every Labour Member who had spoken had urged the Government to accept the principle of it in order to meet the case they had been dealing with, and speakers on the Unionist side of the House—enthusiastic supporters of the Government—had urged its acceptance. Why did they not accept it? It was the Government who ought to have proposed the Amendment, because it was they who said that this Bill was going to benefit the working men of this country. The right hon. Member for Birmingham had said this Bill was going to keep out cheap labour, and it was because this Amendment was calculated to have that effect that it had been moved. He hoped the working classes, especially in the East End, would note the attitude the Government were adopting. It would be interesting to know the views of the hon. Member for Stepney on the point. What the Amendment desired to guard against had happened several times in the past, one instance being that of the Dowlais Colliery dispute eighteen months ago, when fifty Spaniards were brought in. But if the view of the Government was that such an event was not likely to happen, why were they wasting time in opposing the Amendment? It had also to be remembered that after the passage of this Bill, if the expectations of the promoters were realised, the conditions would be entirely altered. The present supply of cheap labour would be practically stopped, so that the Free Labour Association would have to go abroad and bring the cheap labour in under contract. From the Party point of view nothing could be better, so far as the Opposition were concerned, than that the Government should refuse the Amendment, but, believing that the alteration ought in justice to be made, he appealed to the Government to accept it.

*Mr. DUKE (Plymouth) had a difficulty in understanding why the Government were so punctilious about accepting this Amendment. One of the objects of the Bill was to protect the pockets of the ratepayers generally from the burdens cast upon them by the undue access of undesirable aliens. The object of the Amendment was to protect British labour from unnatural and unwholesome competition; and he failed to see how the introduction of cheap unskilled labour during a strike could be described as a natural process. What was to become of those labourers when the purpose for which they had been introduced was accomplished. Either they or the labourers they had displaced would probably have to be maintained by the community. He was not very enthusiastic about legislation to exclude anybody from this country, but he would regard the importation of such competitors in any industry in which he was interested as being as undesirable as the introduction of persons with no means of livelihood. The object of the Amendment being to prevent an unnatural competition of alien labour which would probably cause pauperism, the proposal was not inconsistent with the general scheme of the Bill, and, as he was strongly in favour of preserving England as far as possible for Englishmen, he could not vote against the Amendment.

*Mr. EMMOTT agreed that from the Party point of view the Opposition could not have a better cry than would be provided by the refusal of the Government to accept this Amendment, but, because of its inherent justice and reasonableness, he hoped some concession would be made. It was said this Amendment was protectionist—that if we were to forbid cheap labour we must tax the products of that labour. The effect of foreign protection was to make goods neither cheap nor excellent. We did not fear the goods therefore. Under our free trade system, however, wages in this country were higher than on the Continent, so that there was a perpetual inducement to bring labour over from Europe to compete with the workers here at a lower rate. All the Amendment proposed was to prevent such labour from taking the place of English labour during a trade dispute. Surely that was a very reasonable proposal. The Home Secretary had said that one of the reasons this Bill was introduced was to prevent these poor aliens that came in from falling quickly into the hands of sweaters. It was assuredly an equally good reason to keep aliens from coming in to lower the trades union conditions and take the place of British workmen engaged in a trade dispute. The second argument of the Home Secretary was that there had been no instances in which labourers had been brought from abroad on contract to take the place of men on strike. Several such instances had been given by hon. Members in that debate. In addition to the instances already given he might mention the case of Silvertown, where Belgians were brought in to take the place of the bottle-blowers on strike. Through their agency the British workers were defeated, but the Belgians themselves, he was told, were for the most part now on the rates. He did not in the least abate his hostility to the clause, but if it was to be passed it ought certainly to apply to this class of aliens as well as to those already included.

Mr. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said it was possible that the Amendment might be unnecessary, but, on the other hand, it might be very necessary, and he suggested to the Home Secretary that if he could not actually adopt the Amendment he should agree to the ordinary Party machinery not being brought into play.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) reminded the House that the general feeling in Committee was that something in the nature of this Amendment ought to be accepted. He had supported the general principle of the Bill, but he thought that if the measure were passed without this proviso the evil of the introduction of foreign "blackleg" labour would be accentuated, because the ordinary immigrant, who to a large extent was used for "blackleg" purposes, would be excluded, and the men, instead of coming in casually, would be brought in under contract for this specific purpose. He submitted that to oppose an Amendment the object of which was to prevent such transactions was not a consistent attitude for supporters of the Bill to adopt, and he hoped the Government would endeavour to meet the point.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said there was absolutely nothing in the Bill which would facilitate the introduction of foreign labour to compete with British workmen in case of a strike. The Bill left that problem exactly where it now stood, and was directed to an altogether different object. It proposed to exclude alien immigrants who were undesirable from any of the points of view enumerated in the Bill, and this new element would be inconsistent with the general principle of the measure in the sense that it would introduce something absolutely novel and alien thereto. He quite admitted that the question was one on which much might be said. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had suggested that it was closely connected with the employment of foreign labour on British ships. Matters such as that were of enormous importance, but he protested against their being introduced into a measure of this kind. The objections, in his opinion, were insuperable. He hoped the House would not listen to the appeal which had been made by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy.

Mr. DALZIEL: All the speakers on your own side gave the same advice

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the very anxiety of the hon. Member in giving that advice seemed to him to be somewhat suspicious. He hoped he was not considered to be unduly credulous or suspicious, but the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy had said frankly that he was no friend of the Bill, and he hoped hon. Members on the Government side would bear in mind that by introducing an element of this kind they would be doing much to wreck a measure which would be likely to do a great deal of good, but which would not bear the introduction of this alien element. He hoped none of his hon. friends would act upon the advice which had been given them by hon. Gentlemen opposite, who were the avowed enemies of this Bill and who desired its destruction.

Mr. HARWOOD (Bolton) said the somewhat passionate eloquence of the right hon. Gentleman was entirely beside the mark. The right hon. and learned Gentleman said that this Amendment was alien to the Bill, but that was not so at all. The Bill was intended to keep out aliens who were not likely to be able to earn their own living. This Amendment laid down that they should not accept as proof or probability a contract from an employer where a strike was going on. If ever there was a case proved up to the hilt it was this case, and for the right hon. Gentleman to talk of this being an alien matter was simply nonsense. He had stated that those who supported this Amendment were opposed to the Bill and wanted a free influx of aliens into this country. Now the Government were trying to place a net to catch certain people, and they were going to catch those who might be an advantage to the country and let through those who did most harm and who were certain to throw British workmen out of employment. The people who would be kept out would be those who very often introduced into this country new trades and found employment for others.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes,163; Noes, 230. (Division List No. 287.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles,Lt.-Col.H.F.(Middlesex
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,N.E.(York,NR.Whitby
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cawley, Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Capt. A.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis
Harwood, George
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hunt, Rowland
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan,W
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Marks, Harry Hananel
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley,Rt.Hon.John(Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Muldoon, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway,N.
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith,H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R.(N'thants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vincent, Col.SirC.E.H(Sheffield
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W,
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Glagsow)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Keir Hardie and Mr. Bell.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hon.SirH
Bailey, James (Walworth
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon.AJ(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHn.GeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir FrederickGeorge
Banner, John S. Harmood-

Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick. Rt, Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor
Chamberlain, Rt.HnJ.A.(Worc
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. SirJosephC
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred.Dixon
Dorington,Rt. Hon.Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, RtHn.AilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay,RtHn SirR.B.(Inverness
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rHaml'ts
Gore, Hon, S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnEldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nd'rry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heath,SirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. FrederickWm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(MileEnd)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot(Birkenhead
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Liddell, Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh,W.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,Rt.HnSirHE.(Wigton
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hon.SirFrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hon.J.Scott(Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt.Hon.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marleybone, W.
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, RtHnJ.Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxfd.Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. SirWilliamH
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Sir CharlesGE(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Chares Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE moved to insert the words "for political reasons," with the object of exempting political refugees from the scope of the Bill. He said the Amendment in regard to political refugees had not been before the House, having been shut out by the closure when the Bill was in Committee. This was a matter which was probably more prominent in the minds of a large number of the people of this country than any other matter connected with the Bill. All that had been said with regard to the principle of asylum in cases of religious persecution applied with greater force to the subject of political persecution. The words which the Government had introduced in order to meet this point were obviously unsatisfactory and insufficient. He had not heard any Member of the House confess publicly or privately that the Government words were sufficient to meet what was admitted to be a grievance that should be met. It was, he admitted, very difficult to find words to meet the case. The Government Amendment was confined to those who sought refuge in this country for the purpose of avoiding prosecution for an offence. It was admitted that that could be shown in the case of very few political refugees. Cases, for instance, must be present to their minds of distinguished refugees who had come from Russia at various times. In those cases actual avoidance of a definite prosecution for a political offence could hardly ever be shown.

Of course, in Russia there was an enormous amount of arbitrary arrest for the holding of political ideals—for mere suspicion of holding certain political opinions. In 1896 it was supposed that arbitrary arrest for political offences had ceased. A Ukase was published at that time which was received throughout the civilised world as meaning that arbitrary arrest had been discontinued, but that Ukase was so worded that it did not give effect to the meaning ascribed to it by the European Press. There had been a larger number of arrests since the issue of that Ukase than ever at any time before except in connection with the Polish insurrections of 1830 and 1861. Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace, the most sound and least sensational writer about Russia, in discussing the Ukase in the new edition of his book, stated that arbitrary arrest and imprisonment had really increased. Sir Donald gave the figures for 1903, which he had every reason to suppose came from the very highest source. There were 4,867 persons sent into the various forms of exile in different parts of Siberia without any form of trial. That number, in a single year, showed the extent to which political persecution had been carried in the Russian Empire. It was perfectly certain that none of the persons who escaped from detention in Russia, or who fled from Russia when they had a warning of arbitrary arrest, would come under the words of exemption proposed by the Government. It would be necessary to prove the existence of a charge to show that the words were applicable, and that could not be shown in any of those cases. Of course, the House knew how terrible was the life to which persons who held certain political opinions were condemned: Friends of his own, men of the highest repute in the scientific and literary world, had been exiled to remote Governments for holding opinions which in any other country would have passed unnoticed. There were some of the settlements where men were sent for holding political opinions and where they invariably became mad in two or three years. It would be difficult to find words which would not be thought by the Government dangerously vague, yet he ventured to suggest that the form of words which the Government proposed were wholly insufficient:

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 12, to leave out from the word 'country,' to the word 'leave,' in line 13, and insert the words 'for political reasons'"—(*Sir Charles Dilke*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'solely to avoid prosecution,' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. SPEAKER rose to put the Question.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE asked whether the Government had no reply to give to the convincing speech of his right hon. friend on a question which, he should have thought, would have appealed to every Englishman irrespective of Party. It would indeed be the most extraordinary part of the course which had been pursued by the Government in regard to this matter if they treated with contempt the arguments of the right hon. Baronet, and did not vouchsafe a reply on this vital question. The Prime Minister was a man who had occupied a seat in this House for many years, and who had had the privilege——

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I rise to apologise. I own that to describe the noble Lord's interpretation of our silence as nonsense is an undesirable form of interjection, though not un-Parliamentary. But I must say that the noble Lord's interpretation of the silence of the Attorney-General and myself, when we were actually considering the point, as a contempt of the right hon. Baronet was so absurd that I cannot conceive the noble Lord really means it.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE asked how could he obtain a knowledge of what was going on on the Treasury Bench. He waited and thought that his right hon. friend would be followed by someone on behalf of the Government, but he observed no intention on the part of either the Attorney-General or the Prime Minister to rise, and it was only when the Speaker was about to put the Question that he interposed. He felt sure that the right hon. Gentleman's interjection was not intended to reach him, and that it was far from the intention of the right hon. Gentleman to be discourteous to him. But he wished to urge upon the House that this was a very vital question, and that they should not let it go without further discussion This was a point on which previous Foreign Secretaries, both Liberal and Conservative, had fought hard and long. The House surely could not have forgotten the efforts that were made repeatedly last century by foreign Governments to get something of this kind into English legislation, and that their efforts were met by the firm and determined opposition of our own Foreign Ministers. After the Polish and Hungarian insurrections the foreign Ambassadors pressed on Lord Palmerston and Lord Granville, almost to discourtesy, for a change in the English law, and it led to something like an unfriendly feeling between the two Courts. There was a Foreign Office despatch by Lord Granville, which was very carefully revised by Lord John Russell, in which it was very firmly stated that under no circumstances would this country yield one inch on this question. It was pointed out in that despatch that what ought to be remembered by all English Parties and by the Governments abroad was that any Government or any person who might be asking for the exclusion of certain foreign aliens might the day after have to come to this country and seek the benefit of the asylum that we had always given to foreign refugees from either religious or political persecution. That had been the case in regard to France, according to whether the Royalist or Republican movement was triumphant. After the lamentable assassination of the Emperor of Russia an attempt was made to induce us to alter our alien laws, and so also in regard to movements in Greece and Turkey, but Lord Granville put his foot down and said there should be no alteration at all.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the noble Lord had made a most uncalled-for attack upon the Attorney-General and himself which he should have thought the long Parliamentary experience of the noble Lord would have guarded him from making.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE: I made no attack.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The noble Lord made a violent and unjustifiable attack. He assumed that we were going to take not the smallest notice of the right hon. Baronet and his Amendment. That was a most preposterous charge.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE: I did not rise until I saw that the Speaker was about to put the Question, and I rose only to avert the danger of the Question being disposed of without any reply being made by the Government.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the noble Lord was amply justified in rising, but he was not justified in the remarks which he had made. The right hon. Baronet had rightly stated that there was no difference of opinion in the House as to the desirability of admitting aliens into this country who were genuinely driven out of their own country on the grounds of their being accused of political crime or involved in political agitation. The right hon. Baronet had stated that there was no difference between either side of the House as to the desirability of giving persons entry into this country who were driven out of their own country on the ground of being involved in political agitation, or in consequence of being accused of political crimes, or of being in danger of political punishment. There was really no difference of opinion between them, and the passionate appeal made by the noble Lord was really on this occasion thrown away.

The right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean admitted that to carry out this common object was by no means an easy matter, and he did not think the right hon. Baronet's own words would really meet the case. He thought he would recognise that they were far too wide. The question was how could they so word the clause as to let in those they desired to let in, and keep out those they desired to keep out. They had reached the point at which they must agree that it was legitimate to keep out the immigrant coming under the various categories described in the clause, but the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet would not keep them out at all. A man had only to say he disliked the political conditions of the country he lived in to be able to come in. He might have been slighted by his fellow-citizens when standing for some office, or think his merits were not sufficiently appreciated by the Party to which he belonged, and he would be able to come in under the right hon. Baronet's Amendment by saying really the political controversy was raging in his own country in a manner which caused him very much inconvenience and made life intolerable. The man who was destitute and who, therefore, was of the class they desired to exclude might turn their intentions to nought by saying the political conditions of the country in which he lived were so utterly repulsive to him that he preferred the calmer atmosphere of British institutions. That was not the class they desired to admit even if they were destitute; the class they did desire to admit, even though they were destitute, were those who, in peril of their lives or in peril of their liberty, were really flying their country to avoid a hard fate which, in less happily situated communities than our own, too often overcome those who opposed the Government of the day.

The right hon. Baronet recommended words to their notice, but in the course of his speech he very nearly suggested that the difficulty was so great that he feared his words were too wide. He (Mr. Balfour) thought they were too wide, and he did not think it would be possible, therefore, for the Government to accept them. He had consulted with his learned friend as to whether it was not possible to find words not open to the objection to which those of the right hon. Baronet were open, and which would yet carry out that object which both sides had in view, and he thought it might be done if the clause were made to read "Solely to avoid prosecution or punishment on religious or political grounds or for an offence of a political character." He thought if the House would accept those words they would meet the case of the right hon. Baronet; and he ventured to suggest that he should withdraw his Amendment and allow his learned friend to substitute the words he had just read.

Mr. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said he agreed that they ought to discuss the proper form of words to be inserted to carry out what was the common purpose on both sides of the House, but they on that side of the House took strong exception to the exclusion of aliens on the ground of poverty alone, and, if the choice were between words which seemed too wide and words which were certainly too narrow, he thought the House ought to err on the side of generosity. There were two competing forms of words from which they had to make their choice. First of all, there were the words of the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean, which were very wide indeed and which would cover almost every conceivable case of a refugee coming to this country, although that need not trouble the mind of the House at all, because it was perfectly certain that any tribunal, whether immigration officers or a Court of law, which had to interpret the words would interpret them in the best sense, that the person came here not out of caprice but because the conditions of his own country made it unsafe for him to stay there. He did not think it would be the policy of this country to exclude anyone who came to this country under those conditions. Then there were the words of the right hon. Gentleman, which included only the two cases where a refugee was seeking to avoid either prosecution or punishment. There were a great many cases in which a man came here as a political refugee and yet could not be said to be seeking to avoid either prosecution or punishment. Prosecution meant a criminal proceeding in a Court of law for some offence against the law; punishment meant what the proceeding, when carried to its conclusion, resulted in. ["No."] He would be glad to know if punishment had any other meaning.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he should have thought that imprisonment without form of law was punishment, although there was no prosecution.

MR. ASQUITH suggested the case of a man who was subjected to arbitrary confiscation of property without prosecution. Was that punishment?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should have thought so.

MR. ASQUITH thought that this should be made perfectly clear. The right hon. Gentleman let fall one expression which he heard with great satisfaction, because it seemed to embody the true principle, and that was when he spoke of men leaving their country from peril to life or liberty. If the words were adopted—"to avoid danger to life, limb, or liberty on political or religious grounds," he believed they would not be one whit too wide to meet the circumstances of the case, and he imagined would give general satisfaction.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) did not think the Amendment of the hon. Baronet could possibly be accepted. The Amendment would cover the not unlikely case of a man who fled to avoid conscription. That might be a very large class indeed. They might all be said to come over as political refugees. It had occurred to him that if the words "affecting life, limb, or liberty," were put in after the word "punishment," the Amendment would be one which would carry out the intention of the hon. Baronet.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) asked whether the Prime Minister would adopt words to cover political cases similar to those which he had adopted with regard to religious refugees. If the right hon. Gentleman gave the same protection to political as he had given to religious refugees that would cover everything.

MAJOR SEELY expressed the opinion that the suggestion of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, if adopted, would meet with universal agreement, especially if in addition they were made to apply, as the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stretford suggested, to religious and political belief.

MR. FORDE RIDLEY (Bethnal Green, S.W.) pointed out that the words of the Amendment were wider than they need be, and he suggested that the word "imminent" should be put in in front of "danger."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY suggested to the House that it was not desirable to insert the word "imminent," at all events in the place proposed. There was an Amendment lower down on the Paper which would more properly deal with that.

LORD HUGH CECIL said the acceptance of such an Amendment would be altogether a departure from the arrangement come to in Committee.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he would suggest to the hon. Gentleman and to the House that it was not desirable at that moment to complicate the clause further by saying "punishment involving danger to life, limb, or liberty." All punishment must affect person or liberty, and therefore it was quite enough to say "to avoid prosecution or punishment on religious or political grounds." It would be difficult to find words that would satisfy everyone, but he submitted they would come nearest to covering the whole point by the formula he had suggested, viz., "solely to avoid prosecution or punishment on religious or political grounds or for an offence of a political character."

Mr. RUFUS ISAACS (Reading) suggested that the views of the House might be met by the provision being made to read as follows—"Solely to avoid prosecution or punishment on religious or political grounds or prosecution for an offence of a political character, or to avoid persecution involving danger to life or limb on account of religious or political belief." The Amendment as it stood was too narrow in that it would not touch persecution involving danger.

Major EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) rose to move an Amendment, the object of which was to limit the application of the proposed exemptions to cases of actual and immediate persecution or danger,

***Mr. SPEAKER** intimated that that raised a separate and distinct issue which would be reached in due time.

***Sir CHARLES DILKE** said that as no satisfactory arrangement had been come to he should be obliged to take the sense of the House.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 244; Noes, 162. (Division List No. 288.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hon.SirH
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth, R.(Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F.(Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (Kings Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex.H.(Shropsh.)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, RtHn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hon.SirJosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred.Dixon
Dorington, Rt.Hon.SirJohnE.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hon.Sir WilliamHart
Egerton, Hon.A. de Tatton
Fellowes, RtHn.AilwynEdward
Fergusson, RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, RtHn.SirRB.(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortsecue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon, Maj.Evans-(T'rH'mlts
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath,SirJames(Staffords.N.W
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenryCecil

Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Liddell, Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie, Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir HE(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H.(Dumfriessh.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. SirFrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hon. J.Scott(Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm.RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Sir Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marleybone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, SirH.(Renfrew
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,HC(Northumb.Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn.Arthur-(Ormskirk
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon.Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHnJ.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirCEH.(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A.Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn.HerbertHenry
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N.E.(York,NRWhitby
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt EC(S Andr'wsBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander(Lanark,N.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gladstone, RtHn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife,West)
Hutchinson, Dr. CharlesFredk.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James

Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan,W.
Lambert, George
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hn.John(Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, JohnE.(Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint
Spencer, RtHn C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley
Warner, Thomas Courtenay, T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Harwood.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 12, after the word 'prosecution,' to insert the words 'or punishment on religious grounds or.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 13, after the word 'character,' to insert the words 'or persecution, involving danger of imprisonment or danger to life or limb, on account of religious belief.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS moved another Amendment in the same sub-section relating to an immigrant who wished to enter the country so as to avoid "persecution, involving danger of imprisonment or danger to life or limb, on account of religious belief."

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON moved to amend the Home Secretary's Amendment by inserting words with the object of providing that the exemption should be limited to actual and immediate cases of hardship personal to the individual who pleaded them. No one recognised more cordially and fully than he did that asylum should be granted to people who were in imminent danger of this kind, as, for instance, those flying from such outrages as recently occurred at Kishineff, but he thought there was great difficulty in framing words which, while exempting such persons, would not at the same time open the door to all immigrants from Eastern Europe, however undesirable, on a general plea of misgovernment in their own country. He was doubtful whether, even if the words he suggested were accepted, this difficulty would be entirely overcome. He begged the House to realise exactly what the effect of the original Amendment would be. On page 1 of the Bill they were setting up elaborate machinery to exclude certain classes admittedly undesirable. That was the main object of the Bill, and gave effect to the principle of the Bill. This principle had been affirmed on two occasions by large majorities in that House. On page 2 it was now proposed to introduce words by which fully nine-tenths of these people could claim exemption, not on the ground that they were in any immediate danger, or that they were religious or political refugees in the sense in which the people of this country really understood the term, but because of the general misgovernment in Eastern Europe. While, therefore, they affirmed in one place that the economically unfit ought to be excluded in the interests of the people of this country, in another they gave every wastrel and mendicant a new statutory right to come in, provided he took the very slight trouble of rendering himself liable to punishment on religious or political grounds in Russia, Roumania, or Armenia. He was afraid that the proposed exemptions would provide shipowners and masters with very easy means of evading the Act, and that they would have little difficulty in educating the immigrants up to the requisite degree of persecution. He recognised that there were those in that House who disbelieved in the policy of excluding anybody, and whose desire was, therefore, to render this Bill useless. There were others who, while supporting the Bill in principle, desired to provide a refuge for the genuine victims of persecution.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

ALIENS BILL.

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment [17th July] proposed on Consideration of the Bill, as amended.

Which Amendment was—

"In page 2, line 13, after the word 'character,' to insert the words 'or persecution, involving danger of imprisonment or danger to life or limb, on account of religious belief.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON, continuing his speech, said that when the House adjourned he was saying there were some who, while supporting the Bill in principle, desired to provide a refuge for the genuine victims of persecution. Among those they had to count the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich. There was no one in this House or outside of it for whose capacity and fair-mindedness he had a more profound respect, and he could assure the noble Lord if anything should shake his convictions it would be his noble friend's attitude on this matter. But had his noble friend thought this matter out, and did he realise where his opinion was leading him? The noble Lord had said that he over-estimated the scope of the Bill—but he thought the noble Lord had under-estimated the effect of the exemptions which he desired to see introduced into it. The Amendment said that we could not exclude persons who came here solely to avoid prosecution or punishment for an offence of a political character. The word "solely" might leave some room for discrimination—but who could decide upon a man's motive in such a case, otherwise than upon the evidence which he himself chose to give with regard to it? Apart from that it was unquestionable that an indefinite risk of punishment or prosecution hung over the head of a large majority of all the subjects of the Czar. Two influences would therefore be set in operation. On the one hand the Russian Government and its officials would only have to threaten punishment in order to compel us to receive anyone of whom they wished to be rid—and on the other hand anyone, however unemployable and undeserving, who was desirous of leaving Russia and settling in this country would only have to qualify as a political offender to gain the right to come here. Nothing was easier than to obtain that qualification. He might become a member of any unauthorised society, and then, as all such societies were prohibited, say that he was in fear of punishment for an offence of a political character—or he had only to possess himself of a revolutionary leaflet, or even to be seen in suspected company, in order to place himself within the four corners of this exemption. Was it the intention of the advocates of this Amendment that all such persons, whether desirable or not, should be admitted here as of right?

Then as to punishment or persecution on the ground of religion. In order to qualify for admission under this head, it would only be necessary for persons to transgress one of the numberless rules in the tomes of special laws applicable to Jews and other non-orthodox sects in Russia. They need only leave the village or town in which they were registered as domiciled without permission, or bathe in the sea at some prohibited place, for instance, at Libau, where there was a regulation forbidding Jews to bathe in the sea, in order to say that they were liable to punishment because they held certain religious belief. Was one sea-bath to entitle the economically unfit to enter and obtain citizenship in this country. Was it intended that we should, not by indulgence as hitherto, but by statutory provision, admit in future all such persons who had transgressed Russian regulations, possibly of set purpose, and had thus rendered themselves liable to trifling punishments? He was entirely at one with the noble Lord in desiring to give refuge and asylum to people who were in danger of serious punishment or injury, but while allowing such to come we must safeguard ourselves against the wider effects of a general plea. There did exist, in fact, a perfectly clear distinction between those persons who were genuine refugees fleeing from outrage and personal danger and those who wished to use the general political and religious *regime* in Eastern Europe to get them into this country, where they would, under the Bill, be otherwise inadmissible, and we ought in our legislation to recognise that absolutely actual and vital distinction. Let them take the Armenians' case. There were signs that an exodus of these people was already commencing. Shipping agents were recruiting them among the emigrants to America, and of course there were rejections of them in New York. Were we to admit an Armenian immigration wholesale, irrespective of individual character or fitness and of the effect on our own industrial conditions?

The Amendment as it stood made no provision as to the imminence of the punishment to which it referred. An offence of some kind might have been committed years before which rendered the offender liable to punishment of some kind in his country of origin, and we should be powerless to exclude such a person, however undesirable. The words which he proposed to insert were intended to meet that contingency.

Major Evans Gordon.

Might he again point out the anomalous position we were in with regard to expulsion and repatriation as distinct from exclusion. As far as he could discern there were numbers of Members on both sides who regarded exclusion of undesirables who gave themselves the description of refugees at the port of arrival as barbarous, while expulsion or repatriation of these same persons after arrival was legitimate. In the debate of Wednesday last he said that the Jewish Board of Guardians and other Jewish organisations had no hesitation in repatriating their undesirable co-religionists who, for one reason or another, had become a burden here. The hon. Member for Cleveland thereupon stated that all these people were sent back at their own request, and that none of them were victims of religious persecution. He had had no opportunity of contradicting that statement at the time, but as the matter was of great importance he hoped the House would allow him to do so now. The hon. Gentleman must have spoken in ignorance of the evidence given before the Royal Commission on this subject by such important members of the Jewish community as Mr. Leonard Cohen, the chairman of the Jewish Board of Guardians, Mr. N. S. Josephs, of the Russo-Jewish Committee, and other witnesses. He would beg hon. Members to refer to this evidence. It showed in the most unmistakable manner that the persons sent back did not go of their own accord. If hon. Members would refer to the evidence they would see at Question 16,233 that Mr. N. S. Josephs, when asked whether these people returned home willingly, made the following reply—

> "Perhaps they will at first be very unwilling and they will ask for help in the meantime, which we always refuse. Eventually they will come and say, 'We are prepared to go home'"

On this Lord James, the Chairman, remarked—

> "The fact is you starve them out of the country" and the witness replied, "Yes."

And further he again repeated that it was simply a case of starving them out. Not one word was said with regard to any exception being made in favour of persons who were the victims of persecution in their own country. This aspect of the matter was never taken into consideration at all when repatriation cases were being considered, and at Question 15,511, when Mr. Leonard Cohen was asked whether he would object to the State attempting to do what the Jewish community themselves considered it advisable to do, he replied—

> "I should consider it most desirable to keep out undesirable aliens."

and in reply to the Colonial Secretary he said that it had always been the policy of the Jewish Board of Guardians to restrict the influx as far as possible. And this policy was steadily pursued quite irrespective of the treatment meted out to these people in Russia or Roumania. In this connection he would remind the House that in the year 1900 there was a sudden influx of refugees from Roumania. The reason for their coming was the malicious misgovernment they had been subjected to by the Roumanian Government. Did this fact prevent the Jewish authorities from sending them back to their homes? Not at all. A very large percentage was sent, and the Jewish Board of Guardians protested in the strongest terms against these refugees having ever been allowed to come here.

He therefore hoped that he had said enough to show that the hon. Member for Cleveland entirely mis-stated the facts when he said that persons repatriated returned voluntarily, and that none of such persons were the victims of persecution. In the opinion of Mr. Leonard Cohen it would be far more humane to prevent these people arriving here than to starve them out of this country after their arrival. But what he desired to point out especially was this —the responsible Jewish authorities here, large-minded and generous as they were, saw quite well that it would be disastrous to them and their struggling co-religionists if the general conditions of misgovernment in Eastern Europe were to be held to constitute a reason why every wastrel and destitute wanderer should claim and find asylum here as a religious refugee. They recognised no such right; they themselves knew that we must either open the floodgates of Eastern Europe unconditionally upon this country and take the consequence without palliation, or else decline to put a premium on the general misgovernment in those regions by receiving under the general amnesty of a religious refugee clause persons whom, for the specific reason of their character or condition, it was desirable, as the principle of the Bill affirmed, to keep out.

If hon. Members opposite, and some hon. Members on these benches, really meant to bring in every Russian who was potentially an object of oppression in that country, despite the consequence to our own people, they ought to do much more than oppose this clause and this whole Bill; they ought to bring in a measure compulsorily to stop the Jewish Board of Guardians from repatriating their own co-religionists, as they habitually did. He thought the House should clearly realise to what we were committing ourselves. In any case he wished to make his own position perfectly clear. He desired above all things not to be a party to any deception from which the East of London might suffer in this matter, and not to claim that this Bill wauld produce results which he did not believe it would produce. Much, of course, depended upon its administration and upon the interpretation of the words they were now discussing. All he could say was that after very careful consideration they appeared to him, even perhaps with the additional words he had put down, to be too wide, and to jeopardise much that he considered in the Bill to be of the highest importance. He begged to move.

MR. FORDE RIDLEY, in seconding the Amendment, said the words proposed by the Home Secretary did not go far enough to guard against the danger of opening wide the door to all who chose to say they were subjected in the country from which they fled to religious or political disabilities. Any man of the Hebrew faith might say he did not enjoy liberty in certain Continental States, and he might say it with perfect truth, but the admission upon this general allegation would defeat the object of the Bill.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

> "In line 2, after the first word 'or,' to insert the word 'imminent.'"—(*Major Evans Gordon.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'imminent' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

LORD HUGH CECIL hoped the Government would adhere to the Amendment as it stood. He had listened with attention to his hon. and gallant friend, and, not suspecting him of any want of sympathy with those it was the object of the Amendment to protect, he could not understand how from his hon. friend's point of view the Amendment would improve the Government proposal. There was no difference, whether the punishment was imminent or remote, and the imminence had nothing to do with its severity. At what particular point did the danger become imminent? Were they to wait until the police were actually on the track of the refugee, or would the issue of a warrant be sufficient, or the fact that accusation had been made or suspicion aroused? It seemed to him the word added nothing but confusion to the Amendment as it stood. He was much more apprehensive that the genuine refugee would not be able to get through than that the safeguards were not sufficient. No one would make a journey to a foreign country on a trivial ground. The immigration board might take his hon. friend's point of view, and might say, "Is it credible that a person would have made this long journey solely on the ground that he was subjected to a trifling danger?" The immigration board would interpret the Bill in a natural way, and would say that the immigrant was exposed to such a degree of persecution as induced him to make a long journey.

The question of danger to life and limb went far beyond that of civil disability. The Amendment would cover cases where the persecution was not conducted under legal methods, but where there was some sort of lawless violence, as for instance by the Cossacks, countenanced by the Government. That sort of persecution was of a most oppressive character, and it was very difficult to define in words. Was it to be supposed that persons who suffered from that sort of oppression were to be excluded from this country, or that they were to be required to show that the danger they were in was an imminent danger? The Huguenots came into this country precisely on these terms, and a whole range of persons could be found who had been driven to emigration by religious persecution.

He was very glad that this Government Amendment had been put down, and he hoped that it would be maintained. The only objection that could be reasonably made to it was that it might appear to leave too large a discretion to the immigration officer and immigration board. He did not himself admire the part of the Bill which left so wide a discretion to the immigration officer, but the discretion left in the case of refugees was not so difficult to exercise as that in regard to persons who had the difficult task of proving that they could make a decent livelihood in this country. Nothing was so difficult as to show that one could make a decent livelihood, and differences of interpretation were left open to the immigration officer. The words of the Government Amendment were far more precise, and he was very glad indeed that the Government had decided to submit it to the House. He would have been sorry if, on a plea of excluding criminals, lunatics, or other undesirable persons, they had done an act so uncharitable as to shut our doors in the face of those suffering from oppression. He was sure his hon. friend and his supporters did not wish to do that, and he hoped that the Amendment would be withdrawn.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that his noble friend had referred to what passed in the Committee stage when the House practically came to the conclusion that the words in the Amendment proposed from these benches should be adopted. He was disposed to agree with his noble friend; and he thought the House would be well advised in adhering to the words proposed by the Government, and in regarding them as embodying what was, he did not say a formal compact between both sides of the House excluding proposals of emendation, but what was almost regarded in Committee as a settled question. He was very reluctant to accept either from one side of the House or the other any Amendment to the form of words on which they had been practically agreed. He did not think the words the hon. Member proposed would make the duty of the immigration commissioners more clear than it was made by the words proposed by the Government. He did not think that his hon. friend had really sufficiently considered the value of the word "solely" which was at the beginning of the Government Amendment. He would ask the House to resist any change in the words on which there had been a common agreement in Committee, and he suggested to his hon. friend that he should withdraw his Amendment.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON said that in view of the statement of the Prime Minister he asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment to the Bill, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.) begged to move that after the word "imprisonment" there should be inserted "or of confiscation of property, or of penal exile." He submitted that these words did not in any way alter the sense of the clause, while, at the same time, they extended the Bill in a direction in conformity with the views of the Government and of every Member of the House. Penal exile was one of the most common forms of persecution in Russia at the present time.

***SIR CHARLES DILKE** appealed to his hon. friend to separate the word "property" from "liberty."

MR. NORMAN said he would be very glad to divide the two and would simply move "or confiscation of property."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

"In line 2, after the word 'imprisonment' to insert the words 'or of confiscation of property.'"—(*Mr. Norman.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he hoped the House would not accept this Amendment, not merely on the ground that it was opposed to the words already arrived at in Committee, but that the Amendment was unnecessary.

Question put, and negatived

***SIR CHARLES DILKE** moved to insert the word "liberty." He said that he did this on behalf of his right hon. friend the Member for East Fife. If the word were inserted the Home Secretary's Amendment would read "or to avoid persecution involving danger of imprisonment, or danger to liberty, life, or limb, on account of religious belief."

MR. EMMOTT seconded the Amendment.

Another Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

"In line 2, after the word 'to' to insert the word 'liberty.'"—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'liberty' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he hoped that the House would adhere to the form of words on the Paper. He was of opinion that the use of the word "imprisonment" would meet the necessities of the case; and he ventured to think that in the word "liberty" or the phrase "penal exile" there lurked a certain ambiguity. Mere exile did not necessarily mean imprisonment. He assumed that the case meant to be dealt with was that of banishment to Siberia or Archangel.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON confessed he was in agreement with the Attorney-General that in the majority of cases exile did not mean imprisonment. A man who was exiled might be permitted to wander over a very large area, and in that sense he would not be in imprisonment. He hoped the Prime Minister would accept the Amendment, and that the right hon. Gentleman would consider that this question of exile was almost as great a danger as imprisonment, because the men were taken from their homes and sent elsewhere to a great distance. He did not agree that the words proposed by the Government were accepted in the Committee. Great importance was then attached to the word "liberty."

Mr. NORMAN said that the Attorney-General was very ill-informed as to the subject of exile in Russia. A man might be exiled to a district with which there were no means of communication, and turned entirely loose in an Arctic wilderness hundreds of miles from civilisation. To speak of that as imprisonment was ridiculous. Then the people were interned in different towns in Russia, and that was why they wanted to have these words inserted in the Bill. He did not see why the words of the Home Secretary's Amendment should be regarded as sacrosanct.

Mr. BOND (Nottingham, E.) said that some hon. Members on his side of the House sympathised to a considerable extent with hon. Gentlemen opposite, and he suggested to insert after "danger to life or limb," the words 'or of deportation."

Major SEELY said that, although a particular form of words was more or less agreed upon in Committee, this particular word "liberty" was the one on which they were not entirely agreed. He himself thought that "liberty" was too wide, and had suggested "freedom." However, "liberty" was a word which was so thoroughly understood by the people, and by any possible immigration commissioners, that he thought the Prime Minister would be well advised to accept the Amendment. Could not the Prime Minister trust his own countrymen to understand what danger to "life, limb, or liberty" really meant? The word "liberty" was better than the word "deportation."

Mr. COHEN (Islington, E.) said he joined in the appeal to his right hon. friend to accept the Amendment. He would not do so if he thought it would be in any way a departure from the understanding arrived at the other day. So far as he was concerned, he wished to pay a tribute to the way in which the Home Secretary had met the objections which had been urged against the Bill, and, therefore, he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to include this word "liberty" in his Amendment.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that he did not suggest that any of those hon. Gentlemen who had spoken in favour of the Amendment were desirous of departing from the agreement arrived at in Committee. He made no such charge or suggestion. He was still of the opinion that the word "freedom" was ambiguous. It added nothing to the security or advantage of the persons whom they desired to aid and protect, and it opened a very wide field of qualifications to any undesirable alien who wished to break through the provisions and safeguards of the Act. It had been said that it was absurd to say that it was imprisonment to send a person to Siberia, because he really had an enormous tract to wander over, and that nobody in that condition could be discribed as a prisoner. He did not agree with that at all, but, if it were so, he ventured to say that he could not be described as having been deprived of his freedom. If he were not imprisoned when he was sent to Siberia, then he did not lose his liberty. In both cases he was at liberty to wander over thousands of square miles, for his prison was no doubt very large.

Major SEELY: A prison must be a small thing.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that he was sure the hon. Gentleman who interrupted him was as great a lover of personal freedom as anybody. If he were told he must go to South America and not leave, would he or would he not say that that was interfering with his liberty?

Major SEELY: Certainly, but I should not be imprisoned.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think he would. Imprisoned he certainly would be. Then he thinks there would be no interference with his liberty?

Major SEELY: Oh yes, there would be interference with my liberty, but there would not be imprisonment. A prison must by law be a small place.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that another phrase used in the debate was really not only ambiguous but absolutely misleading. It had been described as being exiled to be sent to Siberia. "Exiled," strictly, was being sent from one's own country to some other country.

Mr. NORMAN: What would the right hon. Gentleman call deportation to Siberia?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he should call it "deportation to Siberia." But seriously, did anybody describe it as being exiled to have to go to some place within the limits of his own country. He ventured to think that all the House desired to obtain in the way of protection for those unfortunate victims of persecution was to use the words they had put in the Bill, and if in their interest they chose to stretch them, they would put in terms which would do a good deal to destroy the efficacy of a Bill which, by a large majority, the House had accepted in principle. Under these circumstances, he thought the House would be well advised if they adhered to the words which, though not agreed to, he freely admitted, the other night did, he believed, substantially carry out the common object of both sides of the House.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 147; Noes, 203. (Division List No. 289.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N. E. (York, NR, Whitby
Buxton, Sydney Charles (Poplar
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macveagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W,
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N,)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestly, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Richards, Thomas
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James

Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T(Huddersf'ld
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hon.SirH
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, SirHoratio D.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, RtHnAilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. GeorgeH.
Finlay, RtHnSirR.B.(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,Maj.Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, SirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland.
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,Frederick N.S.
Liddell, Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James(Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J.Scott(Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purkis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel, (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty

Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirCEH(Sheffield)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashtonund.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Viscount Valentia.

MR. RUFUS ISAACS moved to add the words "or political opinions." He said that would make the words read "or persecution involving danger of imprisonment or danger to life and limb on account of religious belief or political opinions." In spite of what had fallen from the Prime Minister during the discussion on the last Amendment, he ventured to hope that he would see his way to assent to the Amendment, because he believed it only gave effect to the sentiments expressed by the right hon. Gentleman and those who sat on his side of the House. He took it that it was an accepted principle that the Prime Minister and others on that side of the House were desirous with them of giving protection to those who sought our shores in consequence of persecution on account of their political opinions. They had already almost arrived at an agreement, he thought, to use the Prime Minister's phrase, with reference to religious opinions, and he was asking the House to give the same protection and freedom to those seeking the asylum of these shores from persecution on account of political opinions. He did not think the House would desire in any way to curtail that freedom, and he did not suppose the House would desire that there should be less freedom given to those who came here on account of political persecution than was given to those who came on account of religious persecution.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE seconded.

Another Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

"At the end, to add the words 'or political opinions.'"—(*Mr. Rufus Isaacs.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added to the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he hoped the House would not think it necessary to adopt the Amendment. They some time ago passed words which provided for the case of "danger of punishment on political grounds," and wherever a Government interfered with a man's liberty, or his property, and with his person on account of political opinions that was a case of "punishment on political grounds." Punishment was not confined to punishment following legal process; it would also refer to arbitrary punishment without any legal process whatever. With reference to religious views, it was necessary to guard against another case, because one real danger with regard to religious views was that of persecution taking a form of violence, but he did not think the same danger existed with regard to political opinions. That was not a danger to which they were particularly exposed. The real danger of persecution was with reference to religious views. They had specifically provided for "punishment on political grounds," and he submitted that the Amendment, therefore, was not required.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 152; Noes, 214. (Division List No. 290.)

AYES.

Abraham, William(Cork,N. E.)
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John

Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton,N.E(York,NR Whitby)
Buxton,SydneyCharles(Poplar)
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,CaptEC(SAndrw'sBghs)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay,Alexander(LanarkNE)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie,J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hutchinson,Dr. Charles Fredk.

Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones DavidBrynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kennedy,VincentP.(Cavan, W)
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F(Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macveagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan,Col. John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor,James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph

Price, Robert John
Priestly, Arthur
Rea, Russell,
Reddy, M.
Redmond,John E. (Waterford)
Richards, Thomas
Rickett, J. Compton.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spencer,Rt HnC.R.(Northants)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thomson, F.W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath North.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson,Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T.(Huddersf')
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. SirH.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn.A.J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-

Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, SirM. M
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St.
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother

Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Rt. Hn. Ailwyn Edw.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Rt. Hn. Sir R. B(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rHm'lets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding‘ Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir James (Stafford s N W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Liddell, Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Harry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby, de Eresby Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Proposed words inserted in the Bill.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR moved to omit the words "immediately after a period of residence in the United Kingdom of not less than six months." The proposal, he said, dealt with the case of the alien who had been alternately described as the "Flying Dutchman" and the "Wandering Jew." Under the clause, an alien who left Liverpool for New York and was there refused admission ran the risk of not being allowed to land again at Liverpool, with the result that he would have to remain in perpetual custody on the steamer. The words in the Bill amounted to this—that if an alien had resided for six months in the United Kingdom he was to be allowed to go to New York, and, if he was rejected there to come back and enter this country without further trouble. He failed to understand the reason for imposing this residential test, and the object of the Amendment was to delete it. If it was the wish of the promoters of the Bill to get rid of the alien he saw no reason why they should make it difficult for him to leave the country. He could understand the Government's desiring to prevent the entry of aliens, but once the entry had been effected there was surely no reason for putting impediments in the way of shipowners taking them away again. The object should be to get them out again as soon as possible, and he hoped the Government, if they could not abolish it altogether, would at any rate modify the provision.

Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR formally seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 19, to leave out from the word, 'country,' to the word 'he,' in line 21."—(*Mr Austin Taylor.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said these words were introduced by way of a concession to the shipowning interest and in consequence of an Amendment moved in Committee by his hon. friend the Member for the East Toxteth Division of Liverpool. It was felt that it was not desirable that this country should be made the dumping ground of persons who entered it for a short time, took ticket to New York, were rejected there, and then brought back to be left on our hands. These words were introduced to meet that case. It was necessary to take some period as a test of residence which would qualify an alien to possess a right, as it were, to return to the United Kingdom, and he thought the House would be of opinion that in taking six month the Government had selected a reasonable test.

Mr. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said the Government had whittled down the Amendment which they promised to meet in Committee in a perfectly foolish way. It left the immigrant who had resided in the country for any period less than six months—it might be that he had lived here for five months—under the disability of having to be perpetually carried to and fro between New York and Liverpool, which the Government themselves had declared to be foolish. What was to happen to such a man if the vessel came to an end? Was he to be laid up for ever in port? Or what was to be done with him if the vessel were broken up? What was wanted was to get him back to his country of origin, and this Amendment, so far from assisting in that direction, actually prevented its being done. The "Lucania" or the "Campania" could not be compelled to go to Hamburg by way of a change simply to get rid of an undesirable passenger

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: He could be put on board a ship going to Hamburg.

Mr. RUNCIMAN asked how that could be done if the company had no ship going to Hamburg. The man could not be put on another vessel by force. The six months limit made the Amendment which the Attorney-General himself inserted in Committee perfectly ridiculous, and, unless the Government cut it out, the Amendment was really no concession at all.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 220; Noes, 162. (Division List No. 291.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R.(Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.(Birm.)
Chamberlain, RtHnJA.(Worc.)
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A de Tatton.
Fellowes, RtHnAilwynEdward
Fergusson, RtHnSirJ.(Manc'r.)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, RtHnSirRB.(Inv'rn'ss)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, ArthurHoward(Hanley)
Heath, SirJames(Staffords.NW
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside)
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John(KentFaversham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(MileEnd)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Liddell, Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott(Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, DavidJ.(Wathamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neil, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Roberston, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, HC(North'mb.Tyneside)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon. Arthur(Ormskirk)
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt.Hon.Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHnJ.G.(Oxf'dUniv.)
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirCEH(Sheffield)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt.Hon.SirWilliamH
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.Col.A.C.E.(Taunton)
Welby, SirCharlesG.E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby, de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bond, Edward
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N. E (York, N R, Whitby
Buxton, Sydney Charles (Poplar
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal. W.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield. Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John
Nannetti Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestly, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Richards, Thomas
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack. John Bamford
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Hudd'rsf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Austin Taylor and Mr. Runciman.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) said he did not intend to raise points which had already been decided, but in moving to omit certain words inserted by the Attorney-General he did not think that the Prime Minister could plead that this was a case in which there was anything like common agreement. Take the case of poor people who had emigrated from this country, and, having failed abroad, returned to their native land as steerage passengers. Imagine a ship coming into this country with a number of native-born Englishmen on board who had been naturalised abroad. Some of them would, no doubt, desire to settle down in the land of their birth, but those who happened to have been naturalised in America, although Englishmen, would be classed as aliens. He should like to know exactly what was meant by "a temporary stay." This Bill was never intended to deal with British subjects who had been naturalised abroad. The Attorney-General had told them that there might be criminals amongst them, but he protested against the insinuation that the class of Englishmen of whom he was speaking were likely to contain any undue proportion of criminals. The criminal alluded to by the Attorney-General was a man who had already been punished in a foreign country, and why should he be punished again upon coming to this country? It would be said that he might be an habitual criminal, but even then the ordinary laws were sufficient to deal with him. The man must live somewhere, and he was not so sure that the land which had given birth to a criminal ought to shift its responsibility to the country which had given him hospitality. In the past it had always been their policy to encourage naturalisation in foreign countries, and nothing could encourage good feeling between nations more than making it easy for foreigners to naturalise here and encouraging at the same time our citizens to naturalise abroad. It was not desirable that naturalisation in another country should carry with it penalties or disabilities, or that we should weaken the tie which bound this country to all her children, no matter how far they might have wandered or however much they might have failed.

MAJOR SEELY, in seconding the Amendment, said he could not see what objection the Government could have to the elimination of those words. Lord Bacon laid it down in one of his essays that a man had an inalienable right to return to the country of his birth, and he appealed to the hon. Member for Gravesend to agree with the principle which had been laid down by Lord Bacon. He wished also to again enter his protest against the absurd way in which this Bill had been forced through the House by the closure. Not only hon. Members from Ireland, but hon. Members on both sides of the House were agreed that when a man returned poor and penniless to the land of his birth he should be admitted.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out from the word 'subject,' to the end of Sub-section (3)."—(*Mr. Leif Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said that upon this point they had not been met in a satisfactory manner. He wished to give an instance of the number of Irish-born Americans who wished, even after naturalisation, to return to their native land. One of the steamships which had arrived this week from America at an Irish port brought sixty-six saloon, fifty-nine second-cabin, and 273 steerage passengers, the bulk of the latter being Irish-born. He trusted the Government would allow Irishmen to return freely to the land of their birth.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that it was owing to the previous discussion raised by the hon. Member as to the hardship inflicted upon Irish-born immigrants who were anxious to return to their old homes that the clause had been altered. But the present Amendment proposed to go one step further. The other night he assured the hon. Member for Rhondda that nothing was further from the wish of the Government than to exclude the honest working man. The present Amendment was absolutely different from that rejected the other night. The latter would have admitted criminals, those previously rejected, lunatics, and idiots. The present Amendment, although the hon. Member delivered an impassioned appeal on behalf of repentant criminals desiring to return, would only apply to the British-born person only debarred otherwise by want of means. Having regard to the very small number of such cases, and to the sentiment involved, he thought the House would do well to accept the Amendment.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) thanked the Government for the concession, which met what was regarded as a very serious matter in the country. Whatever might have been in the mind of the Attorney-General when this matter was discussed upon a former occasion, the only thing he had in mind was a man being left out through poverty. He was glad that the Government had met the claims of the workmen whose case had been voiced by himself and other Labour Members last week.

Mr. BUTCHER (York) was very glad the Government had seen their way to meet the case in question, which was one of real hardship. He hoped the House would now accept the Amendment without further discussion.

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. DALZIEL moved the omission of Clause 2 for the purpose of obtaining some further information as to the immigration board and the qualifications of its Members. What guarantee could the Home Secretary give that the three persons appointed to the board would be suitable persons so far as the working of the Act was concerned? Of course the right hon. Gentleman would make an effort to obtain the most suitable persons, but, as the Press would not be admitted to their proceedings, which would practically be carried on in secret, it was all the more important that the greatest care should be taken that the persons appointed were likely to act in conformity with the general desires of the promoters of the Bill. He asked also whether the members of the board were to be paid. As there was to be no appeal against the decisions of the immigration board, he would ask whether the legal profession was to be represented.

Mr. RUNCIMAN seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 1, to leave out Clause 2."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Mr. Shackleton.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said the greatest care would be taken in the selection of members for the boards, and the panel would include a certain number of magistrates. One member of the board would be a magistrate, and of the other two one might be selected for his administrative experience and knowledge of the work of a Poor Law guardian, and the third might be a man of business experience. They had very great hopes of securing the co-operation of the Jewish Board of Guardians, whose experience in this matter would be of invaluable assistance. It was proposed that the members should receive payment for their services at the rate of two or three guineas for each meeting. He had made careful inquiry, and he was sure he would get men who would be generally acceptable, and who would have a thorough knowledge of the work. As to the question whether the Courts would be held in public or private, it would rest with the boards themselves to say whether their Courts should be open or *in camera*. They could not lay down any definite rule in the Bill on that matter. The boards were the proper persons to decide as to how the proceedings should be conducted in their own Courts. He was sure that the boards would consist of excellent and capable men who would see that justice was done not only to the people of this country but also to the immigrants.

Mr. GUEST (Plymouth) said this Amendment raised a very important point. The Home Secretary had given a great deal of information as to the kind of executive he proposed to set up, but he had not stated what was to be the size of the panel to be appointed in connection with each Court, who would submit that panel to him, and upon what grounds he would select certain gentlemen to serve. It would be very important to know whether, when a panel was once selected, the members would be taken in rotation, whether it would be possible for the immigration officer to select a few gentlemen who happened to agree with him on the question of the exclusion of immigrants, or whether it would be essential for him to take the gentlemen in rotation. It was felt by some Members on his side of the House that an exceedingly zealous immigration officer, feeling that the importation of aliens was on the whole undesirable, might show a tendency to select for the panel certain gentlemen with whom he could get on, and who would be prepared to proceed easily and comfortably in the exclusion of aliens. Would the remuneration which was to be given to the members of the board be sufficient to tempt gentlemen on the panel whose impartiality would be absolutely above question?

MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.) said it appeared from the Home Secretary's Answer that the word "business" had a wider signification than he might have attributed to it. He asked whether a wide interpretation would be put on the word "business" in the provision that the board should consist of "fit persons having magisterial, business, or administrative experience." On the Committee stage of the Bill he had an Amendment down to substitute "industrial" for "business," because he thought that word had a wider meaning. It was important to have gentlemen on the boards who were familiar with certain classes of occupation. If immigrants came here as skilled labourers they might be men we should be glad to have. They would be in a position to maintain themselves and not come upon the rates. It was quite obvious, however, that an unskilled labourer might be inclined to say, "I am a cotton spinner," or something of that sort. If there was a man with definite personal knowledge of actual manufactures on the board he would be able by asking the immigrant half-a-dozen questions to see whether he was a skilled labourer or not. If the meaning of "business" did not include "industrial" he should be inclined to move the substitution of the latter word.

MR. CHURCHILL (Oldham) said he took it that persons of business experience would include gentlemen who were engaged in industrial enterprises, such as managers of mills. There were other Questions which he should like the Home Secretary to answer. It was very important the House should know what was to be the exact composition and character of these immigration boards, seeing that they were to interpret the Act. The Home Secretary said that members of the boards were to be paid two or three guineas each time they sat. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to make up his mind on that point. Surely a board which disposed of 300 aliens at a sitting should be remunerated at a higher rate than one which dealt with only two or three cases. With regard also to procedure, he submitted that the sittings of these boards should take place in public if aliens attending before them should so desire it. It was perfectly true that the board might have to examine into delicate matters which the alien would desire to keep secret. That ought to be a matter to be settled in each particular case. Could the right hon. Gentleman secure to the alien the right to have his case investigated in public at his own initiative? When the practical working at the ports of entry was contemplated one was drawn more and more to the conclusion that this measure would never play a real and substantial part in the life of the country, and that it would speedily fall into what was called in the United States a "condition of innocuous desuetude."

DR. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye) asked when the boards were to meet.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said it must depend on circumstances how often the boards would meet. It was perfectly true that at the port of London there would be three or four sittings of the board in a week at certain times of the year, while at certain other ports the board would not meet more than once a fortnight or three weeks. The boards would meet as required. The proposed boards could be called together at any time. It was the desire of the Government that there should be no delay in dealing with immigrants after their arrival. In appointing members of the panel it would be his intention that labour should be represented as well as capital. The size of the panel must depend on circumstances. He did not propose that the panel should be a merely nominal one, but intended that the members should be taken as far as possible in rotation.

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

NAVAL PRIZE BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

CROWN LANDS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TRANSFER OF TREASURY POWERS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

ACCIDENTS (MINES AND FACTORIES) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

TRADE MARKS (RECOMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee; Committee report Progress; to sit again this day.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACTS (EXTENSION) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

CANALS (No. 2) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

LAND JUDGE'S COURT (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "by counties, of the Estates in the Land Judge's Court over which Receivers have been appointed in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 182, of Session 1904.)"—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) asked the Patronage Secretary of the Treasury whether he could give any denial of the alarming rumours which had been afloat to-night about dissension in the Cabinet. He asked whether it was true that the Lord Chancellor had threatened resignation on account of the Redistribution proposals; whether a special meeting of the Party opposite had been called for to-morrow, and whether the calling of that Party had anything to do with the difficulties of the Government. He thought they had got into a state of things with regard to public business which made it desirable that the House, as well as the Party opposite, should be taken into the confidence of the Government. It was obvious they could not go on wasting their time simply because the supporters of the Government would not come to the House between nine and ten and forego their cigar and coffee after dinner. Therefore, he asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could give them any information that the Government would make a strong appeal to their Party to enable them to go on with public business, and he would press him particularly with regard to the announcement to be made on the morrow, and also as to the threatened resignation of the Lord Chancellor.

MR. CHURCHILL (Oldham) said he would like the Patronage-Secretary at the Executive meeting on the morrow to call the attention of the Party to the great ignorance displayed by the Prime Minister on several occasions with reference to matters which came under his own special authority and responsibility. Everybody knew of the case when the Prime Minister informed an astonished and amazed country that we were much more likely to be at war with Switzerland than with the Orange Free State. Then there were the cases, earlier in that session, when debates were held in the House, and when the Leader of the House stated the next day that he was not aware the debates were held or that the fiscal Resolutions were passed by the House over which he presided. They thought that ignorance the more remarkable, because the Patronage Secretary had given the Prime Minister a full account of all the transactions. Then there was the extraordinary ignorance of the Prime Minister with reference to the Colonial Conference. The right hon. Gentleman, choosing that inspiring theme for the subject of a hurried address at Edinburgh, never seemed to have taken the trouble to have made himself acquainted with the fact that an automatic conference would in the ordinary course meet. It struck him with an air of a new revelation that under the Government of which he was Leader Resolutions had been passed which made it desirable and necessary that such a conference should meet in automatic course. He ventured to say that no Prime Minister, certainly not in recorded time, had ever before, in regard to matters of which he should be better informed than anybody, shown such lamentable and extraordinary ignorance, and he thought that was a matter which the right hon. Gentleman the Patronage Secretary should lose no time in bringing before the notice of his supporters and friends at the Foreign Office on the morrow.

But he should not venture to stand between the House and adjournment on this particular point of the ignorance of the Prime Minister on matters of which he ought to be well informed, were it not for the most extraordinary instance which had occurred in regard to the Redistribution Resolutions. It was eminently characteristic of what he might call the "Balfourian" method of discharging public business. He did not use the phrase in any offensive sense, but it seem to cover the two right hon. Gentlemen *Par nobile fratrum.* This was the latest family dodge of prolonging their period of office, and as it was a subject about which they felt so intensely he wondered that they did not take the trouble to acquaint themselves with the ordinary and inevitable procedure of the House in respect to the Resolution they had placed upon the Paper. If it had been an ordinary matter of mere public importance affecting the welfare of the country, or some legislation affecting the working classes, one could easily see how it might have been forgotten; but when it was a Bill involving the continuance of the Government's profligate and incapable reign, it was indeed remarkable that the right hon. Gentleman and his right honourable brother did not take the trouble to look up the precedents.

Mr. Churchill.

He had submitted to the House full specific cases of the gross, unpardonable, and flagrant ignorance exhibited by the Prime Minister on matters for which he was responsible. These were things which came before them, but they could not tell in how many innumerable instances the public might suffer obscurely through the same kind of slip-shod, slap-dash, haphazard manner of doing business. He hoped the Patronage Secretary would draw the Prime Minister's attention to the remarks he had made. It would have given him the greatest satisfaction to have said them to his face, and, fortunately, he hoped to have the opportunity of saying them, if not to his face, at any rate in close proximity to him, at Manchester, during the general election.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington) said he could only express very great regret on the part of his leader, his Party, and himself that owing to the action taken by the junior Member for Oldham he would not be able to attend the Party meeting on the morrow and make his speech. He could only assure the hon. Member for the Kirkcaldy Burghs that there was no dissension in the Government. He would not be in order in discussing the Party meeting, but it did seem rather strange that in a House largely composed of Liberal Members it should be thought an unusual thing for a leader to consult his Party.

Question put, and and agreed put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 18*th July*, 1905.

INTRODUCED.

The right hon. William Court Gully, late Speaker of the House of Commons, having been created Viscount Selby of the city of Carlisle, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

SAT FIRST.

The Lord Balinhard (*E. Southesk*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS) BILL.

Moved, "That the Order made on the 16th day of March last, 'That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2a."—(*The Chairman of Committees.*)

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: My Lords, I rise, on the Motion for the Second Reading of this Bill, to move "That the Bill be read a second time this day three months." I may as well at once tell your Lordships that the provisions of the Bill to which I take exception refer only to one of the systems of tramways which are promoted. There are in this Bill, as I understand, three separate tramways, two of them entirely unobjectionable and not very important, and one of them very important and very objectionable. It is that proposal—the proposal to bring trams over Westminster Bridge down the Embankment and back again over Blackfriars Bridge—to which in its present shape I take exception, and on that ground I desire to move the rejection of the Bill.

I may remind your Lordships that this is no new question except in the sense that it is new in the shape in which it now comes up to your Lordships' House. Attempts have been made from time to time to bring trams over Westminster Bridge, and this House and the Legislature generally has invariably taken the line of refusing to grant the necessary powers. I need not dwell upon the history of this Bill. Suffice it to say that in 1903 and 1904 the Bill was very heavily defeated in the Lower House, and this year it only succeeded in passing by a majority of one, the Speaker giving his casting vote. This is not a Government question, inasmuch as I think sixteen members of His Majesty's Government voted against the Bill in the other House. Not only did it only just succeed in getting through the House of Commons this year, but in the shape in which it now appears it is a totally different Bill from that which then passed the Lower House. I think I shall be able to show your Lordships that it proposes to take a course which will do no good to the public, which will be extremely inconvenient to a large section of the public, which will absolutely infringe the rights of a certain number of persons, and destroy the beauty of one of the prettiest parts of London without in any way improving the facilities for traffic which we all desire to see improved.

If you will allow me, I will take your Lordships round the course of this tramway for the short space of two miles. It is proposed to connect up the tramways at the southern end of Westminster Bridge and take the trams over the bridge. Have the promoters seriously considered the congestion of traffic that will be caused at that particular point by bringing these two tramways together, both of them running on a minute service, which will subsequently become a half-minute service? There is a constant and steady traffic crossing Westminster Bridge and turning to the left to Waterloo. A half-minute service of trams would greatly incommode that traffic. The tramway will then cross Westminster Bridge. How is it proposed that it should cross? It is proposed that it should cross within two feet nine inches of the pavement on the east side of the bridge, obviously making it impossible for any traffic to pass on that side, and every carriage crossing the bridge will have to pass over the lines of tramway before it can get to Waterloo. Moreover, there are a certain number of shops at the southern side of the bridge, and it would be absolutely impossible for any carriage or wagon to stop in front of those premises, and the whole of the business of these tradesmen would be seriously incommoded, if not altogether stopped.

There is a Standing Order of your Lordships House, No. 13, which enacts that when any tramway is proposed to be run within nine feet six inches of the pavement, notice must be given of the intention to do so, not only in general, but also to every person the frontage of whose shop or dwelling is affected, not later than December 15th of the year preceding. That has not been, and could not have been, done in this case, because the particular provision which would necessitate this notice was inserted by the House of Commons Committee after the Bill had passed its Second Reading; but it is a great hardship that the people who have these shops and dwellings should be prevented by this technical fact from the possibility of raising their objections and presenting their case, which, under the Standing Orders of the House, they would have been able to do in the ordinary course of events. I understand also that should this Bill unfortunately pass its Second Reading, the Committee which will have to deal with it will sit on Friday. Well, how is it possible for these people to get up their case and present the aspects of it as it appears to them between now and next Friday?

As I have said, the tramway then crosses Westminster Bridge, to the great inconvenience of the travelling public, and goes down the Embankment. It is not long since the public spent £1,000,000 in beautifying that part of London. It is now proposed to run tramways down the Embankment on the river side, and the result will be to destroy the trees there and to gravely imperil the whole of the amenity of the Embankment, And when the tramway gets to Blackfriars Bridge it is proposed to run it over the bridge, causing, as I maintain, a block in the traffic there, in the same way as it would cause a block in the traffic on Westminster Bridge. These are the great inconveniences which this Bill would produce in the short course of a mile and a-half, or a little more.

I do not wish to appear as opposing the extension of tramways because they are tramways, or because they are promoted by a particular body. I would wish to support the extension of useful tramways, but what arguments have the promoters of this Bill produced to show that this will be a useful tramway? After all, it will go over Westminster Bridge and down the Embankment, where there is certainly not any great demand for traffic and where 'bus companies have never found it worth their while to run a line of 'buses, and then back again over Blackfriars Bridge. If this proposed tramway really connected the north and the south of the Metropolis, I would be one of those who would admit that there was a great deal to be said for it, even if it did inconvenience a certain section of the public. But this Bill does not do that. It merely proposes to take people for a little pleasure trip round the Embankment, and the only proposal which has been seriously put forward for connecting the north with the south was thrown out by the House of Commons' Committee. The proposed tramway, therefore, is not only inconvenient but useless; and it is not only useless, but it cannot be carried out without further legislation.

The Bill which we are asked to pass provides that nothing shall be done until powers are obtained for widening Blackfriars Bridge. The Committee found that it was impracticable to take these tramways over the bridge as the bridge is at present, and the extension cannot be carried out without further powers to be obtained in a Bill next year, and these powers will have to be obtained by a separate authority—the City Corporation. In other words, before the County Council can proceed with these lines they will have to get the City to promote a Bill next year for the widening, at considerable cost, of Blackfriars Bridge. Therefore this legislation is not only inconvenient and useless, but it is incomplete. I believe it has not been the practice of this House to pass legislation in an incomplete form. There was one occasion this year where the Great Northern and Strand Railway were promoting a single line crossing under the river, which the Committee of the Lower House said could not be completed unless they got powers to make the single line into a double line; and I understand that the Chairman of Committees of your Lordships' House ruled that because it was an incomplete Bill and could not be carried out in its completion this year the Bill could not proceed. This Bill, at any rate, is an incomplete Bill, and, if incomplete Bills cannot be passed, this Bill should not be proceeded with.

I do not know that there is any other feature of this measure which I need weary your Lordships by referring to. I would only say this in general, that this is surely not a moment in which to add another complication to the complicated system of traffic in London. What, my Lords, is the real difficulty with which the Royal Commission on Traffic have had to deal? The real difficulty has been the multiplication of different interests and different systems of traffic. If that Commission began *de novo* with London a grass field, it would be easy to make the traffic ideal and work properly; but this multiplicity of different systems makes the matter a very difficult one. One of the recommendations of the Royal Commission that a Traffic Board shall be appointed in order to deal with the general system of traffic in London. Are we to make the labours of that board, if, as I hope, it is appointed, greater by imposing another vested interest upon them to deal with? I maintain, therefore, that this is not a moment to pass legislation which will not really solve the problem of north and south tramways, which many of us would desire to see, but which will add another difficulty to the already great difficulties in London, and which will further burden the ratepayers of the Metropolis with an expenditure of some £350,000 at a time when nobody can say with certainty that motor omnibuses will not supersede trams in the future. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and add at the end of the Motion the words 'this day three months.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

*LORD CHELMSFORD: My Lords, I hope you will allow me to intervene in this debate as a member of the County Council who are promoting the Bill the rejection of which the noble Viscount has just moved, and I hope your Lordships will realise the very serious course which you are asked to pursue. It is usual on these occasions to send the Bill to be discussed in its details to a Committee of your Lordships' House, and it is certainly extremely unusual to take the course of rejecting the Bill before the Committee stage. I therefore urge you to pause before you follow my noble friend into the lobby this afternoon.

Now, what is the position we find ourselves in with regard to this Bill? Here is a great administrative body, the London County Council, set up to administer the government of the Metropolis, and this body comes forward in the usual way with a Bill which, if it had been promoted by, say, Manchester, Liverpool, or Birmingham, would have been considered at any rate, as a measure which ought not to be discussed on Second Reading in this House. The proposals contained in the Bill are not only practically unanimously supported in that great body, but they also find considerable support from the local authorities all round London. Out of twenty-eight borough councils in London twenty-one are actually supporting the Bill. The other seven have not taken any action, some because they have no tramways at all in their area, and others because they are not interested in the matter. I am not sure what the City of Westminster is doing at the present moment, but that authority, in whose area this tramway would be laid, showed its mind by not petitioning against the Bill in the other House.

It is not as if this proposal of the County Council was being examined for the first time. My noble friend referred just now to a close division which took place on the Second Reading in the House of Commons, and he said the Bill was carried by the casting vote of the Speaker. But since the Second Reading the Bill has been examined and scrutinised most carefully in all its details by a Committee of the other House; and, further, when the Bill issued from the Committee it had, of course, to be read a third time, and there was no opposition in the House of Commons to the Bill as it comes before your Lordships to-day. There are cases, of course, in which the House oppose private Bills on Second Reading. There are cases in which great principles are involved which this House has a right to make up its mind upon before the matter is sent as an open question to a Committee, and there was such a Bill the other day—I think it was promoted by the Woolwich Borough Council—in connection with which a noble Lord moved that either a certain portion should be expunged, or that the Bill should not be read a second time, because it was a private Bill endeavouring to do away with provisions of a public Act. That is the sort of occasion on which this House generally interferes, and says it will not leave the matter as an open question to be sent to a Committee. But where is the principle involved in this Bill?

My noble friend who has made a speech denouncing the provisions of the Bill has gone into details which would be examined by a Committee when the case went before it. I have no doubt that some of your Lordships have received a long list of reasons for the rejection of the Bill. I have very carefully perused these reasons, and can only find one which can be said to go to show that there is a principle involved in the Bill which would justify your Lordships in pursuing the course recommended by the noble Viscount; and that is this: that no tramway scheme should proceed until the House has had an opportunity of considering the Report of the Royal Commission on the Traffic of London. I imagine that that reason was inserted before the Report of the Royal Commission was published; for what does this Royal Commission, which has been sitting two years, report on this matter? It has reported in favour of the very procedure which the County Council are adopting. Among the tramway lines suggested is one going over Westminster Bridge, down the Victoria Embankment and over Blackfriars Bridge—the very proposal we are discussing here this afternoon. It is suggested that we should wait and consider that Report. Are we to allow all these tramway schemes to be hung up until Parliament has had time to consider the Report of the Traffic Commission? That Commission was instituted for the very purpose of considering the details of this question, which the Government, in its wisdom, considered that Parliament was not so well adapted to deal with.

The objections urged against this Bill are, as I have said, really matters that should be taken before a Committee. I do not put forward this view speaking absolutely without experience, because I have had some ten years experience before Committees of this House and the other House, and certainly all these points which have been urged by my noble friend are points which one regularly hears discussed before Committees. One rather plausible argument was put forward by my noble friend—namely, that this is an incomplete Bill, and that next year the City of London will have to bring in a measure for the widening of Blackfriars Bridge. It is said that therefore we had better wait till next year. As a ratepayer in London, I hope your Lordships are going to consider the extra cost that would be put on London by pursuing such a course as that. This Bill would be introduced again next year, the same arguments would be given and the same evidence called, and counsel, solicitors, Parliamentary agents, and witnesses would be paid to reiterate the arguments which have already been established before the Committee of the other House. It is not as if those supporting this Bill are asking you to pass it as a Bill complete in itself, and which, if you support it to-day, will become an Act. All we are asking is that this great body, the County Council of London, should have the right to be heard in favour of these proposals before a Committee of your Lordships' House. I have carefully gone through the evidence in the other House and considered the reasons urged. This is really a case of balance of convenience and inconvenience, and on these grounds, and on the wider ground, that I think the rejection of the Bill on Second Reading would be conferring an unmerited slight on a great body which has done a considerable amount of good work for London, I appeal to your Lordships not to vote against the Second Reading.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I desire to associate myself with the noble Viscount in asking your Lordships to reject this Bill. The noble Lord who spoke last said it was an unusual course for the House to refuse to send a private Bill to a Committee. We have refused to send this Bill to a Committee for three or four sessions, and, as to the question of principle, surely a great principle is involved when you propose to run a tramway down one of the few beautiful thoroughfares we have in London. The Embankment was built not only for the pleasure of the people of London, but for fast traffic to the City, and I fail to see why tramways should be allowed to run along there. Surely the object of tramcars is to pick up and set down passengers *en route*, and if, as the noble Lord says, 'bus companies have found it impossible to run 'buses along the Embankment, the London County Council will be unable to make a tramway service pay.

I would point out that if this Bill passes in its present form, it really means that the tramway will run up the Embankment to Blackfriars Bridge and stop there. It cannot go over the bridge. One of the clauses gives effect to a compromise arrived at by the City Corporation and the County Council, and, except with the consent of the City Corporation in writing, the London County Council must not take the tramways over Blackfriars Bridge until the bridge has been widened or a new bridge constructed. I consider, therefore, that it would be a waste of time and involve unnecessary expense to send the Bill to a Committee. Unless that proviso is entirely cut out, I do not see how the tramways are to get beyond Blackfriars Bridge. If trams are to be taken across the Thames at all, I contend that there should be a tube underneath the river, or a new bridge between Waterloo and Blackfriars to the new Kingsway carried over the Victoria Embankment. This Bill has been fully discussed in several sessions, and the mere fact that the Embankment would be spoilt from an æsthetic point of view by tramways is, I think, in itself sufficient to justify your Lordships in throwing out the Bill. We have few such beautiful sights in London as the Embankment, and I hope your Lordships will decline to have it destroyed by tramways.

*THE DUKE OF RUTLAND: My Lords, as I had something to do many years ago with the Thames Embankment and Westminster Bridge, I hope your Lordships will allow me to say one or two words on this subject. The Thames Embankment had been for many years more or less discussed, but it was not until the appointment by the House of Commons of a Select Committee, of which Sir Joseph Paxton was chairman, on which I had the honour of serving, that anything practical was attempted. It was as a result of that Committee that the Metropolitan Board of Works was authorised and provided with sufficient means to construct that which is the finest public work in London of modern times. I also happened to be First Commissioner when Westminster Bridge was built, and I can assure your Lordships that that bridge was not constructed by representatives of the ratepayers of London, but under Government supervision and out of funds which the State provided. Therefore, I say that the State has good reason to look after the maintenance of the Thames Embankment and Westminster Bridge and protect them against the attacks which year after year have been made by the London County Council—a body which had nothing whatever to do with the creation of either one or the other.

The noble Lord who has defended the action of the County Council says there has been one instance in his recollection in which the House of Lords has taken the course of rejecting a private Bill on Second Reading, but he said that was only on the ground that the private Bill proposed to subvert that which had been established by a public Act. Well, that is exactly what this Bill is doing. Have not these two great works been initiated and completed by public authority, and is not this an attempt by a private Bill to materially interfere with and utterly spoil both? That is the reason why I have opposed, and why I shall continue to oppose as long as I can, the passsing of a Bill of this kind. It is vain to say that in Committee all these great questions can be considered. I do not believe a Committee on a private Bill of this sort can go into these larger questions, and I therefore ask your Lordships to take your courage in your hands and reject the Bill on Second Reading.

*EARL CARRINGTON: My Lords, I am bound to say, as a member of the London County Council, that I listened to the speech of the noble Viscount who moved the rejection of this Bill and to the speech of Lord Mayo with great consternation. I would venture to impress on the House that this is not a Party question in any sort of way. I hope the House will look at it entirely on its merits, and as a member of the London County Council I can say that if this Bill, to the misfortune of London, should be rejected, we should regard that action with great regret and apprehension. The noble Viscount who spoke first described the Bill as objectionable and useless, and made a great point, which was cheered by the House, about the disfigurement of the Embankment, a matter on which the noble Duke who has just sat down also laid stress. I would remind the House that there is no great congestion of traffic on the Embankment. It is not very much used. Moreover, the Embankment is from sixty-five feet to eighty-five feet wide, and surely two lines of tramway running along the Thames side of the Embankment would not be any very great disfigurement, and it would, besides, be a great boon and advantage to the toiling millions of London.

Viscount Ridley told the House that this tramway would be of no good to the public. I will deal with that point in a moment. He also spoke of the obstruction and congestion of traffic which would ensue if the Bill was allowed to pass. Your Lordships know the terribly congested state of the traffic at the tramway termini at Blackfriars and Westminster Bridges. During Ascot week the congestion at the Westminster terminus is positively dangerous. But that danger and difficulty would be to a great extent removed if the circle was allowed to be completed, and if the cars were permitted to run in a never-ending continuous line. The argument which the noble Viscount used as to the interference with trade by carriages not being able to get up to the shops is one which has always been used when trams have been proposed. We have had it in Tottenham Court Road and other parts of London, and I do not think I need detain the House by arguing that point. The noble Viscount went on to say that this scheme did not connect the tramway systems of the south and north of London. On that point I beg to differ from the noble Viscount. That is exactly what the Bill does.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: I did not mean to say that it did not connect the trams. What I meant to say was that it did not really connect the north of London with the south.

*EARL CARRINGTON: The noble Viscount is correct in this, that there is no junction of line between the north and the south. That was in the Bill, but it was cut out by the Commons House of Parliament. There will be no absolute connection with the trams which serve the northern parts of the Metropolis, but the County Council have now acquired powers to run a tramway through a subway which they take powers to bring on to the Embankment, and to get from the tramways running to and from Westminster and Blackfriars Bridges to this line would only necessitate walking across about eighty-six feet of the Embankment and entering the subway. The noble Viscount, in his reference to the complexity of the traffic problem, omitted to state that the scheme proposed in the Bill has been recommended by the Royal Commission in their Report published this morning. The noble Viscount said the proposed tramway would be of no good to the public. I venture to think that if the noble Lord's speech had been made to any South London constituency, whether as a Progressive or a Moderate, the seat would have been lost to that side.

There are 43,000 men and women crossing each of these bridges morning and evening, wet or fine. That is to say, 86,000 people make the journey across the two bridges daily. Take the case of a young woman who lives at Brixton, and who goes to work somewhere in Holborn or the Strand, or further north. This young woman is able to reach the Blackfriars or Westminster Bridge terminus for a penny, and we propose to carry her the longer route. Just think what that means. It is three-quarters of a mile from the dead end on the south side of Westminster Bridge or from the dead end of the south side at Blackfriars Bridge to the centre of the Embankment opposite where the connection will be to the north of London. If this scheme is not allowed to proceed, you condemn her to walk a mile and a-half a day more than she need do. Taking 300 as the number of working days in the year, it means that she would have to walk 450 extra miles in the course of the year. I appeal to the House to think of this poor girl—it is only a typical case of thousands—who would have to walk an additional mile and a-half a day in all weathers all the year round. The working people are deserving of great consideration, and I urge your Lordships to keep their case in view in giving your decision on this matter. The City Corporation are in favour of the Bill, and, as my noble friend opposite said, twenty-one of the borough councils of the Metropolis are in favour of it, and the councils of the fashionable boroughs which have no tramways of their own, have not, to their honour, opposed the Bill. I most earnestly appeal to the House not to throw out on Second Reading a Bill which has been supported by both parties in the County Council and which is in the true interests of the toilers of the Metropolis.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, noble Lords who have addressed your Lordships on the question of the Second Reading of this Bill have for the most part devoted themselves to a consideration *pro et con* of the merits of the case. It is part of my duty to look very closely into all the private Bills that come before your Lordships, but I would say at once that I do not think I am in any way competent to express an opinion upon this Bill. That is a question which I think can only be decided after hearing the evidence which will be given and the pleadings which will be made on both sides before a Select Committee, and for that reason I venture to hope that your Lordships will not deny it the advantage of being treated in a manner which is usual in the case of all private Bills that come to your Lordships' House.

I shall content myself this evening with pointing out to your Lordships the difference in the position now from the position when this Bill, or a measure kindred to it, was before your Lordships' House in 1903, and was rejected on the Motion of my noble friend Lord Newton. It was then said, and said with justice, that the tramway line ended in the air. It was not proposed that it should cross Westminster Bridge, but should stop at that end of the Embankment. Now the proposal is that there should be a continuous line from the south side of Westminster Bridge to the south side of Blackfriars Bridge, making connection there with the tramways on the south side of the river. It was next said, with great truth, that there was no connection with the trams which served the northern parts of the Metropolis, but, as the noble Earl who has just sat down has pointed out to the House, the County Council have now acquired powers to run a tramway through a subway which they take powers to bring on to the Embankment, although not actually in physical connection with the tramways run from Westminster to Blackfriars Bridge. At any rate, it cannot be said, as it was in 1903, that there is no provision by this Bill for enabling traffic facilities from the south of London to the north.

It has often been said that we must wait for the Report of the Royal Commission on London Traffic. The Royal Commissioners have issued their Report. I will not trouble your Lordships with any extracts from it, but I do not think it has been contested by any of the noble Lords who have spoken in opposition to the Second Reading that the Royal Commissioners are unanimously in favour of trams across Blackfriars and Westminster Bridges. In 1903 there was a very strong and serious opposition from a local authority which I think had great weight with your Lordships. I mean the corporation of the City of London, but in the present case that corporation has agreed to withdraw its opposition. They have done more: they have agreed to co-operate with the London County Council in carrying out, I will not say the imposition, but, at any rate, the condition, which was placed upon the promoters of the Bill in another place—namely, that the tramway shall not be constructed across Blackfriars Bridge until that bridge has either been widened or a new bridge constructed. I venture to think that that puts a very different aspect on the case as presented to your Lordships this year.

Lord Chelmsford drew your Lordships' attention to the fact that twenty-one of the Metropolitan borough councils are supporting the Bill, and that no local authority, up to the present at any rate, is opposing the Bill in your Lordships' House. That is a novel feature, and one which I think ought to weigh with your Lordships. There is another important consideration. In 1903, the Second Reading of this Bill was not met by a direct negative as on the present occasion, but with an instruction to the Committee to which the Bill was to be referred that they should omit certain tramways from their consideration. The noble Viscount now proposes, however, that the Bill should be read this day three months. There are other tramway schemes in this Bill. There is one for the deviation of an authorised line in the south of London; another for the construction of a tramway to complete an existing line and to bring passengers up to the door of the Crystal Palace; and others, including one to work electrically a tramway which is now horse-drawn. If your Lordships throw this Bill out on Second Reading on account of your objection to the tramway coming over Westminster and Blackfriars Bridges, you will at the same time be destroying the prospects of those other proposals which have nothing whatever to do with the question in dispute.

The noble Viscount said that another Bill had been presented to this House which was not allowed to proceed on the ground that it was incomplete. I think the noble Viscount has been misinformed on that point. It was a tube railway Bill, and the point was that, pending the Report of the Royal Commission on Traffic it was deemed inexpedient to allow any tube railways to be promoted. The noble Lord is right in saying that it will be necessary, if this Bill passes, to introduce another Bill into Parliament in order to enable the corporation of the City to widen Blackfriars Bridge; but I do not think that is any reason why your Lordships should depart from the well-established practice of this House. When a Bill is presented containing a number of provisions dealing with tramways in different parts of the Metropolis, it is not wise, simply because to a certain portion of it objection is entertained in certain quarters, that the whole Bill should be thrown out. I hope your Lordships will consent to send the Bill in the usual way to a Select Committee, where it may be thoroughly thrashed out.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, my noble friend the Chairman of Committees has been led to form a false impression as to the nature of the recommendation of the Commissioners. It is a mistake to say that the Commissioners are in favour of this scheme. They say no such thing. What they say is that they have gone with great care and minuteness into the matter, and they point out that the system of tramways might be so arranged as to be of great public advantage. They draw attention to the necessity of communication across the bridges, but only as a part of a general scheme; and it is quite a mistake to quote the Commission as in favour of this particular scheme.

I confess I still entertain the view which I held when it was my painful duty to resist a similar Motion to that now before the House, when moved by the late Chairman of Committees, Lord Morley. It seems to me that a sufficient case has not been made out for the Bill, and that it is proposed to create a very dangerous precedent. The London County Council in its own way has done a very good work, and I have never said anything adverse to that body; but it is a very different thing to ask that they should be granted these enormous powers and the enormous establishment that a scheme of this sort is intended to give them. The Royal Commissioners point out in their Report that within the County of London nearly the whole of the tramways are owned, and in great part worked, by the County Council, and that such tramways as do not belong to them already will be acquired within a few years.

I ask your Lordships to consider what this means. If this scheme, which is admittedly only part of a greater scheme, were carried forward, the London County Council would be invested with enormous power and influence in connection with the proprietary interest which it would possess in an enormous area. I should regard such a situation with very considerable apprehension. I do not apply these remarks to the London County Council alone; I believe them to be applicable to any municipality placed in a similar position. It is undesirable to assist in putting any authority in that position. As to the contention that this Bill should be allowed to go to a Committee to have its merits inquired into, I think that is arguing on a false analogy. Often a scheme is put forward, and it is undesirable to reject it at once because its merits are not known, and until it gets before a Committee no one knows exactly what the scheme is. But we are here discussing a matter which everyone of us understands thoroughly. I am sure all who live in London, or whose business compels them to spend a considerable portion of the year in London, can have no doubt as to the great inconvenience attending the congestion of traffic. The London cabmen and others conduct that traffic with very great skill and temper, but when you are dealing with a tramway you cannot accommodate it to the traffic. It is run on fixed lines and interferes with the free movement of the remaining traffic. Over and over again you see the sort of difficulty there is in getting by when a block occurs among trams, and it would be a very serious matter indeed to add to the present difficulties by giving permission to such a proposal as this. I have thought it right to make this protest against the notion that we are not to exercise our judgment on the matter. We know what the question is, and no points of detail can be brought before the Committee which would alter our views on the main proposal. I shall, therefore, support the rejection of the measure, and I hope your Lordships will adopt the Amendment by such a majority as will prevent the recurrence of these attempts on the part of the London County Council.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I desire to call attention to one or two points arising out of the speech of the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack. I certainly think that the objection which the noble and learned Earl took to the great powers given to the London County Council in the matter of tramways comes rather late in the day. They already have the powers. The proposal in this Bill, more particularly that of bringing tramways across the bridges and along the Embankment, will add very little to those powers. They already have the control of the tramways south of the river, and they will shortly, when the leases fall in, have control of the tramways on the north of the river; and to say that giving them power to link up these two great systems by bringing trams over the bridges and along the Embankment would be a very serious matter is, I think, somewhat of an exaggeration. It is a statement which is not justified by the absolute facts of the case.

The noble and learned Earl also passed entirely in silence the very great argument brought forward by the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees, who pointed out that the Amendment moved by the noble Viscount not only involved the loss of the proposed tramway across the bridges and along the Embankment, but involved also the loss of four or five other great tramway schemes which are of the utmost importance to London. I am sure that your Lordships' House does not wish that these other schemes should also be consigned to limbo. Then the noble Earl said this was a scheme of which we could all judge. Well, on certain broad lines I suppose we can all judge; and the two opposing lines of argument on which we have to judge are these. First, is it to the advantage of London that the tramway system should be extended, that it should be linked up and made as useful as possible? What are the objects of the bridges of London, and what are the objects of the Embankment? They are, I think, primarily for the good of London, and for the use of the people of London, and I contend that the proposals in this Bill increase the utility of the bridges and of the Embankment. Then there is what I suppose is the main ground on which these proposals are resisted—the æsthetic ground. It is thought that this tramway would destroy the view along the Embankment and the beauty of the bridges. I do not for a moment deny that a bridge without a tramway and an embankment without a tramway is a much more æsthetic thing than a bridge or an embankment with a tramway; but at the same time there is some measure of proportion to be considered between the amount of harm that is done to the beauty of a thoroughfare and the amount of advantage given to the people generally; and for my part I consider that the advantage proposed to be given to London by the proposals in this Bill far outweigh any damage that may be done to the beauty of London. We never see a block of traffic on the Embankment, and if there is one road in London more suited than another for a tramway it is the Embankment. I therefore trust that your Lordships will give the Bill a Second Reading.

Lord JAMES of HEREFORD: My Lords, I agree with my noble friend Viscount Ridley in opposing this tramway over the bridges and along the Embankment; but I think there are many noble Lords who share the views of the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees, that it would be a pity to sacrifice lines in respect to which there is no objection. I would therefore ask my noble friend Lord Ridley whether he sees any objection to altering his Amendment and moving an instruction to the Committee not to consider that proposal in the Bill which refers to this particular tramway.

Viscount RIDLEY: I should be very glad to withdraw the Motion for the rejection of the Bill, as I have no desire to impede the other tramways. With your Lordships' permission, therefore, I will substitute an Amendment that it be an instruction to the Committee not to consider ——

Lord TWEEDMOUTH: Surely we cannot deal with an instruction to the Committee until the Bill has been read a second time and notice of the proposed instruction given.

Viscount RIDLEY: I should like to appeal to the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack whether I can substitute an instruction to the Committee for my Motion to reject the Bill.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: The Motion before the House is that the Bill be now read a second time, and, until the Bill is read a second time, it will be impossible to give an instruction to the Committee, because the Bill cannot go to a Committee until it has been given a Second Reading.

Viscount RIDLEY: In that case I personally would wish to offer no objection to the Second Reading of the Bill, but to move an instruction to the Committee after the Second Reading has been agreed to. I understand that this will be in order. [Cries of dissent.] If that is not accepted, then I am afraid I must press my Motion.

On Question, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Motion," their Lordships divided:—Contents, 33; Not-Contents, 64.

CONTENTS.

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshal.*)

Ancaster, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carrington, E. [*Teller.*]
Chesterfield, E.

Crewe, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Onslow, E.
Russell, E.
Spencer, E.
Westmeath, E.

Falkland, V.
Hampden, V.
Selby, V.

Hereford, L. Bp.
Oxford, L. Bp.

Barnard, L.
Belper, L.
Burghclere, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Coleridge, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]

Kinnaird, L.
Ludlow, L.
Monkswell, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Shuttleworth, L.

Stanley of Alderley, L.
Tredegar, L.
Tweedmouth, L.
Welby, L.
Wolverton, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) *L. President.*)

Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.
Portland, D.
Rutland, D.

Bath, M.

Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Dartrey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Egerton, E.
Eldon, E.
Feversham, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Ilchester, E.
Mayo, E. [*Teller.*]
Morton, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Scarbrough, E.

Waldegrave, E.

Churchill, V.
Cross, V.
Goschen, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Knutsford, V.
Portman, V.
Ridley, V. [*Teller.*]
Sidmouth, V.

Allerton, L.
Alverstone, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Ashcombe, L.
Avebury, L.
Balinhard, L. (*E. Southesk.*)
Barrymore, L.
Belhaven and Stenton, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Carysfort, L. (*E. Carysfort.*)
Castletown, L.
Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.

Ellenborough, L.
Hatherton, L.
Hawkesbury, L.
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Heneage,, L.
Hindlip, L.
James, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Errol.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*).
Lawrence, L.
Manners of Haddon, L. (*M. Granby.*)
Muskerry, L.
Newton, L.
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Robertson, L.
Rosmead, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sinclair, L.
Stanmore, L.
Torphichen, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Windsor, L.

Moved, "That the words 'this day three months' be there added."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Bill to be read 2^a this day three months.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill. Reported, without Amendment.

North British Railway (General Powers) Bill. Reported specially, with Amendments.

Caledonian Railway Bill; Liverpool Corporation Bill; South Barracas (Buenos Ayres) Gas and Coke Company Bill [H.L.]. Reported, with Amendments.

Midland Railway Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Thames Conservancy Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 16th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 16) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 17) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a on Thursday next.

PETITIONS.

PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS (REGISTRATION OF PATENT AGENTS) BILL [H.L.].

Petition that the Bill may be referred to a Select Committee; of Patent Agents signing; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

LICENSED HOUSES.

Petition for the early closing of; of Reading and District Temperance Council; Stockport Lodge, No. 300, of the Independent Order of Good Templars. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3440. France (Cherbourg).
No. 3441. Russia (Moscow).

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 634. Belgium (the diamond industry of Antwerp).

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.

Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June, 1905.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).

Fourteenth General Annual Report, by the Board of Trade, under Section 29 of the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of the Amendment made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Thursday next.

SHIPOWNERS' NEGLIGENCE (REMEDIES) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of the Amendment made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Thursday next.

COAL MINES (WEIGHING OF MINERALS) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

MACEDONIA.

Lord NEWTON rose "To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he was prepared to make a further statement with regard to Macedonia; and whether any further Papers would be presented to Parliament." The noble Lord said: My Lords, in recurring to this subject, which has been so frequently debated in this House, I should like to explain that I do so for several reasons. In the first place, there is considerable difficulty in obtaining time for a discussion upon this question in the House of Commons; in the second place, we are approaching in this House the period of the session when the annual congestion of business takes place, and it is impossible to devote much time to any subject, however important; and, in the third place, it appears to me that an opportune moment has arrived when the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs might well make a statement on the subject.

The recent discussions upon this matter have taken the form of assertions by various speakers, myself included, that no actual improvement has taken place in the condition of that part of the world known as Macedonia since the introduction of the Mürzsteg programme; and the reply of the noble Marquess has been to the effect that a slow but gradual improvement is in progress, and that, in fact, things are better than they would appear. As to my own view, I have never concealed the opinion that the slow progress which has attended the work of reform is largely due to the highly inefficient action of the two Powers—Austro-Hungary and Russia—to whom this scheme of reform has been entrusted; and, although I have been censured by the noble Marquess for expressing these views, I am still quite unrepentant, and see no reason to retract from the opinion I have already expressed.

I will not say anything about the position of Austria; but, when you come to think of it seriously, what can be more grotesque, what can be more absurd, than that at the present moment Russia should be entrusted by Europe with a kind of mandate for delivering the oppressed and of instituting improvement and more advanced methods of administration in any part of the world? This procedure really can only be characterised as one of those solemn and elaborate farces which diplomacy sometimes finds it necessary to countenance. On the last occasion that I spoke on the subject in your Lordships' House I pointed out that there was no essential change in the conditions prevailing in that country. I contended that life and property were just as unsafe and that the future was just as menacing; that the fury of the racial struggle was unabated, and that the massacres, assassinations, and atrocities committed by the rival Christian races upon each other were as frequent as ever.

And with reference to those events, which are generally described vaguely as atrocities, I may mention that I constantly receive communications, alternately from Bulgarians and Greeks, furnishing me with long lists of persons who have been assassinated or otherwise maltreated. This is corroborated by impartial testimony from other sources, and, allowing for a reasonable amount of exaggeration, I think the main facts cannot well be disputed; and it is not unnaturally regarded as a scandal that such a state of things should be permitted by the Turkish Government. Possibly it is a scandal; but, on the whole, it is not so surprising as many people appear to imagine, because the authority of the Turkish Government has been so weakened in Macedonia, as in other parts of the Turkish Empire, that really one of the few methods that remain to them of maintaining their rule is by keeping up the divisions which exist between the Christian races.

I have additional testimony as to the correctness of the views I have expressed with regard to the condition of Macedonia in a letter which I have recently received from a gentleman with whom I am acquainted, who has made an extended tour throughout the country, who is a perfectly impartial critic, speaking the language of the various races and who is intimately acquainted with the Balkan Peninsula. This gentleman wrote only a month ago—

"There is as yet no marked or substantial improvement in the condition of the population resulting from the application of the Mürzsteg programme. Such advantages as have been gained are mainly of a negative character. There are now, for instance, fewer complaints with regard to the conduct of the *Gendarmerie*, and this doubtless betokens a certain alteration of the sufferings of the peasantry. The foreign officers stationed in the various districts are powerless to prevent the excesses and barbarities which frequently occur, but the moral effect of their presence is nevertheless considerable, and the recent increase in the number of these impartial and vigilant observers cannot fail to be productive of good. The *Gendarmerie*, however, cannot work satisfactorily until the judiciary of which it is the organ is thoroughly overhauled and subjected to European supervision. But judicial reform must wait until financial reorganisation is effected, and the financial scheme adopted by the Powers has not yet received the assent of the Sultan. There is consequently little positive progress to record."

When I and other speakers pointed out these facts at the end of last March, the noble Marquess, doubtless from a loyal desire to do the best he could for his foreign colleagues, replied that there had been a gradual improvement in the situation, and he specified as instances of improvement that there had been a considerable amount of repatriation. He also stated that hopeful experiments were in progress with regard to the commutation of tithe; and lastly, he pointed out that the foreign *Gendarmerie* was a success.

I admit cheerfully that the experiment of the foreign *Gendarmerie* is a success, although I think it is fair to add that it is only a somewhat partial success. Now, what is the reason why this one portion of the reforms—namely, that relating to the *Gendarmerie*—is a success? To my mind the reason is perfectly obvious. It is because it is international and is not under the exclusive influence of the agents of Austria-Hungary and Russia; and, with regard to the question of the *Gendarmerie*, it is extremely gratifying to us as a nation to observe the confidence which is displayed towards British officers by all sections of the population; and it is one of the most pleasant features in a thoroughly unsatisfactory state of things that all the more intelligent people in the

Near East, whether they be Christians or Mussulmans, recognise that we only wish to do what is right, that we have no desire to annex territory, and, in short, that our motives are above suspicion. I may add, without wishing to boast, that the sentiments with which our representatives are regarded are very different from those with which representatives of other Powers are regarded, who, I regret to say, are frequently looked upon as the pioneers of an annexationist policy. But, to return to the question of the *Gendarmerie*, I must point out that it is really unreasonable to expect too much from this force.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): Hear, hear!

LORD NEWTON: I am glad to hear that the noble Marquess agrees with me. The *Gendarmerie* is a police force intended to deal with the country when it is in a state of peace. Nobody, however optimistic he might be by nature, could successfully contend that what is known as Macedonia is at this moment in a state of peace. It is much more correct to say that it is in a state, if not of actual warfare, at all events in a state approaching actual warfare; and it is perfectly plain that a few thousand *Gendarmerie*, however well trained, well led, and well organised they may be, are quite unable to deal with the immense difficulties of the present situation. I will admit that they have done as much as could well be expected of them; but I gather, from information which I have obtained from persons who have been out there recently, that their task would be considerably facilitated if they could be made really independent of the civil authority, and if, in particular, they could be allowed to have control of the police in the towns and villages where police exist; because, as everybody who has any acquaintance with Turkey knows, the police are the greatest obstacles in many instances to the satisfactory government of the country.

What is the moral of what I have recited? To my mind it is this, that whereas Austria-Hungary and Russia, represented by the civil agents, have failed nearly completely in their task, international control, as distinct from Austria-Hungary and Russian control, has at all events been to a great extent successful. From this it seems to me to follow naturally that the services of these civil agents should be dispensed with on an early opportunity which, as I shall point out, will shortly occur, and that a genuine European control should be substituted for that which now is actually in existence. I must plead guilty to having used somewhat hard words myself with reference to these civil agents, but on mature consideration I am inclined to think they are more deserving of pity than censure, because anyone who has carefully studied their functions will, I think, realise that they do not possess any real power; they are not responsible, so far as I can see, to anyone in particular. They are directed to draw the attention of Hilmi Pashi to anything which may occur to them, but they have no power of enforcing their opinions; and the result is that the *role* which they play is not much more important than that of an official or semi-official spectator.

I desire to point out to the House that the noble Marquess, who, to do him justice, has shown much more interest in these questions than any other Foreign Minister, has a good opportunity before him. The mandate of these civil agents expires shortly .Article 1 of the Mürzsteg Programme says—

> "*Leur mandat expirera dans le delai de deux ans à partir de leur nomination.*"

That is to say, in a few weeks, or in a month or so, their mandate comes to an end. There cannot possibly be any wriggling out of this stipulation. It is perfectly clear that under the scheme the mandate of the two agents comes to an end in a short time; and although Austria-Hungary and Russia have apparently shown a disposition to cling to their exceptional position and have actually put forward a financial reorganisation scheme of their own, which was apparently to be carried out largely at our expense, I am happy to observe that the noble Marquess has intimated that the question has now reached a stage where all the Powers have a right to make themselves heard. And, really, in view of the present situation of Austria-Hungary and Russia, it would be an act of kindness to relieve them from this kind of responsibility and give them time to attend to their own domestic affairs.

What I venture, therefore, to suggest to the noble Marquess is that these civil agents, who are the symbol, so to speak, of Austria-Hungarian and Russian predominance, should disappear, that their functions should be taken over by representatives of the Powers under the general financial reorganisation scheme to which all the Powers have agreed, but to which the assent of the Sultan has not yet been obtained. As the noble Marquess and others have pointed out, financial reorganisation is the basis of improved administration. It is, in fact, the first condition of success, and it is at the root of all judicial and civil reform. What I am disposed to believe myself is that if a really genuine international control, in which each Power is equally represented, can be established, and if the representatives of the various nations are not merely financial experts but men who really understand the country with which they have to deal, then a considerable step will have been taken to avoid a conflict which I personally fear is almost inevitable in the future.

What we have got in Macedonia at present is an unsatisfactory compromise. The Turks are not allowed to govern the country according to their own ideas, and we have nominally European control, which in reality does not exist; and things have now gone so far that it is perfectly plain that they are quite incapable, of their own accord, of re-establishing a proper state of things. If they were sensible—which most unfortunately they are not—they would agree to a genuine international control as the best means of preserving these provinces. Otherwise I think it is perfectly plain that they stand a very great risk of losing them altogether. Therefore, I hope to hear from the noble Marquess that any further development which is contemplated in the direction of reforms will bear a strictly international charter; that, if possible, the Adrianople vilayet will be included in the new scheme; and I sincerely hope it will be effective, not only in the interests of the subject races but in the interests of the Turks.

Our interests in the Near East, whatever some people may think, are not solely humanitarian. I think I may safely say that it is not to the interests of this country, nor to the interests of France or Italy, that one of the great military Empires should find any pretext for eventually establishing itself on the shores of the Ægean. The interest of this country is that the Turkish Empire in Europe should continue, provided the rule can be made tolerable to its subjects; but the present state of Macedonia seems to me to justify the fears I have frequently expressed, and I cannot find any better excuse for my action this evening than in the words which were used by the noble Marquess on the last occasion, when he said that while the condition of the Balkan Peninsula remains what it is that state of things constitutes a standing menace to the peace of Europe.

THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I think the House has reason to be grateful to my noble friend opposite for having brought forward this question which he so thoroughly understands, and I am quite sure that the noble Marquess himself will make no complaint of its having been raised once more. I am disposed to agree with what fell from Lord Newton that there is not much to be gained by merely abusing the Turkish Government. Things being as they are, and the Turkish Government being what it is, it is impossible to expect any very close or useful co-operation from that Government in carrying out reforms in Macedonia. Equally, I think there is no advantage in deriding the two Governments—the Governments of Russia and Austria-Hungary—who have undertaken the very difficult and thankless task of acting for Europe in this matter; but it is permissible to point out that, so far as can be gathered from the Papers on the subject, this dual attempt has been, on the whole, a failure.

The noble Lord said that to some extent the *Gendarmerie* had been a success. I am not prepared to dispute that. I have no doubt that, as time has gone on, they have become somewhat more efficient, thanks to the measures described by the noble Marquess in the last debate; but they are a very small body, considering the extent of ground that has to be covered; and I think it would be reasonable to say that all that they have practically been able to do is to prevent by their presence outrages which might otherwise have taken place. But I find outrages have occurred. In one case at Kuklitch, referred to in a previous debate by the noble Marquess, some forty persons were murdered, and there were ten or twelve cases of outrage, children being included, and more than half the village was burnt with petroleum. I understand that our Ambassador at Constantinople has protested against that outrage and demanded that its perpetrators should receive punishment. I now beg to ask the noble Marquess whether any steps have been taken in the matter and whether anybody has been brought to justice; and, if not, whether he is prepared to take any action. Since the last debate there has been another outrage in which many persons were killed and a village destroyed. Perhaps the noble Marquess will tell us whether anyone has been brought to justice in connection with that matter.

I do not wish to go over the ground covered by the noble Lord, and I will therefore merely ask the noble Marquess one or two Questions relating to the financial aspect of the situation. The financial scheme has been accepted, I think I am right in saying, by all the Powers; but it is the fact, as I understand, that the Sultan has not yet acceded to it. I should like the noble Marquess to tell us whether any provision has been made in the event of the Sultan not acceding to the desire of the Powers for this financial scheme. We know that Turkish methods are of a dilatory character, and it may be the case that the Sultan will not point blank refuse to agree to the scheme; but, in the event of the matter being put off from day to day, week to week, and month to month, perhaps the noble Marquess can tell us whether any provision has been made for applying to the Turkish Government that modified form of coercion which has been efficacious in similar cases. Time is running short, and the dual arrangement will automatically come to an end in the month of October. I do not know whether it would be pressing the noble Marquess too much to ask if any provision has been made for a modification of that arrangement. I find myself in general agreement with the noble Lord that it would be a disastrous thing, both for Macedonia and to some extent for Europe as a whole, if that dual system were allowed to continue; and I hope the noble Marquess, as this is the last occasion probably on which we shall have a chance of asking for information before October, may be able to tell us whether the Powers have arrived at any conclusion as to the modification of that arrangement, and what the views of His Majesty's Government may be on this very crucial point of the whole matter.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD: My Lords, I remember many years ago that unreasonable leniency was shown at school to a first fault, and I believe that a like leniency is shown to what well may be called a first fault, a premonitory symptom of a dangerous tendency—a first speech in your Lordships' House; and I would avail myself of that leniency to speak briefly of the reasons which make me anxious to associate myself with the appeal made by the noble Lord who has brought this subject before us. I always feel that there is a very serious responsibility resting on all who bring pressure in any way to bear on those who hold the helm in matters of public interest unless they are themselves well informed in the things of which they speak; and yet there are certain broad facts before us which do, I think, warrant us all in bearing our part and saying what we feel about this matter.

Let me speak briefly of the two facts which seem to me perfectly clear. The first is that we have before us in Macedonia a state of things crying, with a great and bitter cry, for reform. We have been told, and we are very glad indeed to be told, that there has been some advance; but no one can look at the indisputable reports which come to us without feeling that the state of things in Macedonia is not only, as has been said, a menace to the peace of Europe, but that it also will have a tendency to familiarise us all with the spectacle of misrule and cruelty: and to be so familiarised is bad for every civilised country. So it is not merely in the interests of humanity and of justice, but for the sake of keeping up the right standard of sensitiveness to wrong-doing that we may, I think, bear our part in pressing for courageous methods of reform. That is one fact before us.

The other, I am afraid, is not less clear. It is that the position is one of extraordinary and complicated difficulty. The Powers to which we have turned for help are themselves embarrassed by their own difficulties; the people whom we would help are themselves divided—bitterly divided—by racial and ecclesiastical differences; so that those who should help, and those whom we would succour, alike present us with difficulties of a most serious kind. Now, what are we to do when we feel that the obligation to press for reform rests upon us and that the difficulty besetting the task of reform is incalculably great? May I point to an analogy? The difficulties of relieving poverty are familiar to us all. We have learnt the harm of indiscriminate charity. We know that it may often do as much harm as good. I think that indiscriminate agitation is like indiscriminate charity. But I also think in both cases that total abstinence is not the right course. We cannot abstain from charity. We cannot abstain from bringing what pressure we rightly may bring to bear for the solution of this question.

We can—and this should be, I think, our main object—assure those who have the administration of affairs that in whatever venture they may make for the cause of justice and good government they will have a solid body of national feeling behind them, that they can rely on forces supporting them, that they may know that there is a large body of people in England who do greatly care about this terrible scene of misrule—a large body of people who are willing, whenever the opportunity is given them, to throw all the weight they can into the support of whatever pressure may be brought to bear to bring about a cessation of this disorder and misrule. A general, I suppose, feels strong if he knows that the force behind him is adequate; he feels more confident still if he knows that the force behind him is determined and resolute; perhaps he may act more boldly still if he knows that that force is restless to do something. We should like to assure those who administer affairs that they have behind them a body of public feeling not only strong and resolute but restless until something may be done.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, my noble friend who spoke first referred to the recurrent debates on this subject and recapitulated the case as stated by him on various occasions, and as stated in reply by myself. I do not think that my noble friend and I differ as to the objects which it should be our endeavour to accomplish, and after listening to his speech I am tempted to add that I do not think we differ very much as to the means which should be pursued in endeavouring to arrive at those objects. I am always struck in these debates with the advantage which, if I may so put it, lies with the prosecution. It is so easy to wax indignant over the sufferings of these poor people. It is so simple to complain of the slow progress which has been achieved and, apart from the skill with which my noble friend always handles matters which he brings forward in this House, he has a not very difficult task when he comes here to tell us that the international machine is moving very slowly, that it often sticks in a rut, and when he, so to speak, cracks his whip at us in the hope of making us move rather faster.

My noble friend perhaps underrates both the difficulty of the task with which the Powers are confronted and the measure of success which they have accomplished. As to the difficulty of the task, let me express the pleasure with which I listened to what was said on that point by the right rev. Prelate. May I be permitted to add that, if the speech which he has delivered to us to-night can be described, as he described it, as a first fault, we desire that he should become an habitual criminal? Well, my Lords, the position of the country we are discussing this afternoon remains, I am afraid, very far from satisfactory. Of late the complication has been added to by the appearance of a number of Greek bands, with whom, at first, the Turkish troops seemed to be quite unable to cope, although of late they have shown more activity, and have achieved a greater measure of success. But, if I am to tell your Lordships anything of the general condition of the country, I prefer to rely upon the evidence of one whose testimony I should certainly set against that of the unnamed informant to whom my noble friend referred, although a great deal of what was said by that unnamed informant shows much knowledge of the facts, and a very sound appreciation of them.

Sir Nicholas O'Conor a few days ago reported to us that, owing to the reforms, even so far as they have gone, there is a distinct improvement in the general situation, although the presence of Greek and Bulgarian bands continues to disturb the country. In another despatch he tells us that His Majesty's Consul-General at Salonika ascertained from the Vali of that district that, with the exception of one band, the Bulgarian *komitajis* had been quiescent for some time in the Salonika province. The Vali also stated that there was a marked decrease in the number and activity of the Greek bands in his vilayet, and he trusted that the movement was coming to an end; although he said that there was a great deal of bad blood between the Greeks and the Bulgarians and that there had been several murders within the last few days. His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Uskub reported on July 4th that the comparative improvement in the situation continued during the month of June. The Bulgarians continued to keep quiet, and no news of any encounters between troops and Bulgarian bands had been received since the end of the month of May. There were Servian bands showing activity in the Uskub district, but they were being rapidly split up.

The noble Earl opposite questioned me as to the action which had been taken in consequence of the excesses committed by the Turkish troops on, I think, two occasions. One was the deplorable massacre at a place called Kuklitch. As to that, I am able to tell him that a military commission was appointed to inquire into the conduct of the troops, and that those concerned in those outrages have actually received punishment of various degrees of severity. The inquiry as to the outrages at the other place he mentioned is, I believe, still in progress.

My noble friend, Lord Newton, has spoken to us to-night again of the failure of the Mürzsteg scheme; and I am not here to assert that the numerous proposals embodied in that scheme have been carried out with any general degree of success. But I think it may be said of many of them that nobody could have seriously expected that such proposals could have been carried out to the full within the space of less than two years.

One of those proposals was that there should be a new grouping of nationalities and a sort of rearrangement of population. The sorting and shuffling of human beings in a country in the state that Macedonia is in is a task from which the most courageous reformers might well shrink. We have had, even in these islands, some experience of the difficulty of moving a population from one part of the country to another, and we know that such operations are not very easily conducted. But, my Lords, on other points I think we may fairly say that something has been achieved. The work of repatriation has gone on and is still in progress. I have seen a complaint that the promise made in the Mürzsteg scheme that the inhabitants of some of the villages which have been burnt should be exempted from taxation for a year has not been kept. I have made some inquiry into that; and we have heard from our Consul at Monastir that as a matter of fact these people were exempted from taxation for a year, although, owing to the deficiency of funds in the hands of the local Governments, it is quite possible that the full measure of relief may not always have reached the persons for whom it was intended.

There is another point to which I have always attached great importance. I mean the question of the reform of the tithe system. I do not believe there is any reform the execution of which will have greater practical effect on the well-being of the population than the commutation of the tithes. The experiment was tried in a certain number of villages and proved to be completely successful; and I am assured that it is intended to carry out the same reform in the whole of the three vilayets, and that in the case of seven cantons it will be put into operation at once. Then another point as to which criticism has been offered is the employment of Bashi-Bazouks by the Turks in connection with their Regular troops. As to that I am able to say that our remonstrances have not been without effect, that a proclamation was issued by the Turkish Government condemning any Bashi-Bazouks who might be found with arms in their hands to be shot, and that that proclamation has apparently had a very useful deterrent effect. Sir Nicholas O'Conor, at any rate, reports to us that of late the cases in which Bashi-Bazouks were employed have been exceedingly rare.

My noble friend Lord Newton spoke of the reorganisation of the *Gendarmerie*; and I was very glad to notice that he attached importance to what is being done, and particularly to the manner in which the reorganised *Gendarmerie* in the district for which we are responsible has done its work. I think that is the more creditable, because in this case, although we speak of the reorganisation of the *Gendarmerie*, what was done was really the substitution of a brand-new force for the old, ill-paid, ill-fed, ill-armed, and ill-disciplined body which went by the name of the Macedonian *Gendarmerie*. It is perfectly true, as my noble friend told your Lordships, that in the British district the *Gendarmerie*, and particularly the British officers in command of them, have learnt how to secure the full confidence of the villagers; and outside our own district, although I will not contradict my noble friend when he claims that our district may be regarded as a model district, outside our district General de Giorgis and the international officers associated with him have been able to bring into operation a new scheme of distribution under which the country will be properly mapped out into districts, and posts attached to each district.

I am also told that on the occasion of his recent visit to Constantinople General de Giorgis was able to obtain from the Turkish Government approval for three changes which he has always regarded as of vital importance. I mean the improvement of the *status* of the Turkish officers in command of the *Gendarmerie*, the addition to the *Gendarmerie* of a certain number of recruits drawn from the Turkish Army, and, thirdly, the arming of the force with the Mauser rifle. We are sometimes told that the surveillance exercised by these officers of the *Gendarmerie* over the Turkish troops has proved of little or no value. I do not agree with that. There have been, no doubt, cases in which regrettable excesses have taken place, in spite of the fact that international officers accompanied the Turkish forces; but the presence of these officers has been the means of obtaining authentic information with regard to these occurrences; and it is upon that information that we have been able to found our complaints and remonstrances, which, as I stated a moment ago, have led in some cases to the punishment of the culpable persons. But in other cases it is unquestionable that the presence of European officers with Turkish troops did prove the means of preventing excesses; and I may mention in particular what took place at a village named Smol, where an insurgent band was surrounded and overcome by the Turkish troops and where no damage was inflicted on the peaceable inhabitants.

In the case of the *Gendarmerie*, as in almost all other cases, it is the want of funds which has been the real obstacle to more thorough-going reforms; and I wish to say one word with regard to that question of financial reforms upon which my noble friend touched in his speech. When I last spoke to your Lordships on the subject of Macedonia I mentioned to you that there were at the time no less than three schemes or proposals before the Powers. There was, in the first place, the scheme of reform put forward by the Turkish Government; in the second place and connected with it was the proposal of the Turkish Government that the Customs duties should be increased by 3 per cent. in order to provide the necessary funds; and, in the third place, there was the scheme put forward by Russia and Austria-Hungary. With regard to the increase of the Customs duties I need only remind your Lordships that His Majesty's Government, having regard to our large interest in the commerce of Turkey, found themselves unable to agree to that proposal without further evidence that by an economical and honest administration of the Customs the necessary funds might not be provided without any increase in the scale of duties.

With regard to the two schemes put forward by the Turkish Government on the one hand and by the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Governments on the other, both of which were based upon the agency of the Imperial Ottoman Bank, we found on examination that both those schemes contained some admirable points, but that both of them were defective, in the first place because they did not contain sufficient guarantees that the requirements of the Macedonian provinces would form a first charge upon the revenue or that the sums allocated for different services would reach their destination. Both the schemes seemed to us open to that objection. Besides that, the Turkish scheme seemed to us inadequate because it did not provide for any external control over the execution of reforms, while the scheme of the two Powers was based on the assumption that that control should be exercised by Austria-Hungary and Russia alone. In our view it was essential that if these schemes were to be productive of good results they should be carried out under international control.

That leads me to say a word on a point which figured conspicuously in my noble friend's statement—I mean the so-called mandate given to the two Powers less than two years ago. In the first Article of the Mürzsteg Programme it is said that the work of the civil agents being to watch over the introduction of reforms and the pacification of the population, their mandate would expire in two years from the time of their appointment. The Mürzsteg scheme was presented to the Porte in October, 1903, and the time is, as my noble friend told us, drawing near when that period of two years expires. We have had some discussion—discussion, I am happy to say, of a most friendly nature—with the two Powers in question as to the duration and attributes of the so-called mandate. We never regarded that mandate as conferring upon the civil agents, so to speak, a lease renewable at intervals for ever. On the other hand, we never contemplated that at the expiration of two years the two Powers should be abruptly ousted from the position which had been accorded to them as the Powers geographically and for other reasons specially interested in the fortunes of Macedonia. But I will not recapitulate the arguments which have been used, because I am happy to say that a satisfactory agreement has been arrived at between the Powers concerned, an agreement under which the control of the scheme of financial reforms will be put under what I think my noble friend called genuine international control.

The Marquess of Lansdowne.

I think I can best describe the arrangement which has been accepted by giving your Lordships the substance of the Note presented by all the Powers to the Porte on May 8th last. In that Note the Powers have demanded the assent of the Porte to the following arrangement:—"The Powers are each to nominate a financial delegate to watch over the execution of the financial reforms and the application of the scheme, and to ensure its observance. These delegates will act in concert with the Inspector-General and the civil agents, whose duties have been defined in the Mürzsteg Programme. The Commission thus formed will be given all the powers necessary for the accomplishment of their task, more especially for the supervision of the regular collection of the taxes, including the tithe. The budgets must be submitted to the Commission before being finally adopted. The Commission will have the right to modify any proposals dealing with the receipt or expenditure which may not be in conformity with the laws or with the economical and financial wants of the country. With a view to facilitating their mission, the Commission will have the right of nominating in each vilayet an inspector to superintend the agents employed in the various duties connected with the collection of taxes."

I hope those who have listened to the document which I have just read will see that it involves what I think I may describe without exaggeration as a very long step in the direction of securing not only a more effectual control over the finances of Macedonia, but a control of an international character. It is really no exaggeration to say that upon the satisfactory introduction of such measures of reform depends not only the success of the *Gendarmerie* force, but the question of the reform of the local police, which is an urgent one, of the adequacy of the relief measures to be taken for the succour of the inhabitants of the country, and, above all, of the efficiency and purity of the Law Courts; because if these officials are not paid at all, or are inadequately paid, it is perfectly clear that we must expect to find them either apathetic or, worse still, not incorruptible. So far as to the action of the Powers in this matter.

I have been asked what about the attitude of the Porte. I will state, in the first place, the bare facts of the case. The Note I have read was presented to the Porte on May 8th. On June 24th, not having received a reply, the Powers, through their representatives in Constantinople, demanded one. They received that reply a few days ago—on the 12th of this month—and I regret to say it was a refusal of our demands. As to that I cannot say more than this—that we have no idea of acquiescing in that refusal. And I may say with equal confidence that I do not believe any of the Powers concerned, any more than ourselves, have the slightest idea of receding from the very moderate and reasonable demands which they have put forward. I cannot, therefore, bring myself to contemplate that period of indefinite delay, running not only from week to week, but from month to month, of which my noble friend Lord Crewe spoke; and, although I cannot make any specific statement to your Lordships, I am satisfied that the Powers will insist upon an answer different from that which is at present in their hands.

EARL SPENCER: May I ask the noble Marquess to declare the position of the two Powers in October, after the mandate has been concluded.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I daresay I did not make myself quite clear; but it is stated in the Note that the financial delegates appointed by the other Powers are to act with the Russian and Austro-Hungarian civil agents. On this Commission, which will control the finances and which will be concerned with all questions in which financial considerations are involved, the representatives of the other Powers will be on the same footing as the representatives of Austria-Hungary and Russia.

THE EARL OF CREWE: I should like to ask whether I am right in understanding that in all other respects the *status* of the civil agents remains unchanged.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Yes; no change is made in their *status*. We do not dethrone them; we associate other delegates with them. I hope I have said enough to your Lordships to show that, despite the discouraging experience which I am afraid we have encountered, and which we may encounter in the future, we have at any rate accomplished enough to justify us in dismissing altogether from our minds the idea that this is a task to be abandoned in despair. I should regard such an abandonment as not only disastrous to the Balkan Peninsula, but as highly injurious to the good name of this country. Nor, again, are we prepared to dissociate ourselves in dealing with this question from the other Powers. It is sometimes suggested to us that we should strike out a line of our own, and pursue our own policy fearlessly and without regard to the action of others. In my opinion the adoption of such a policy would find us alone in our glory, and, I am afraid, also alone in our impotence. We believe that we have been justified in endeavouring not to break up the concert of the Powers, that we have done well to work with them so far as we could, to maintain the most friendly and confidential relations with them, to watch events in the Balkan Peninsula, to denounce excesses and irregularities, and to press for reforms, and to induce the other Powers, as far as we could, to work up to the level of the standard which we had set up for our own guidance. That has been our policy. It may have been disappointing in its results; but I venture to express my opinion that it has saved us from worse things, and that it has not been altogether unsuccessful in bringing some benefit to the people of Macedonia.

LORD NEWTON: I should like to ask the noble Marquess whether he proposes to lay any further Papers, and whether he can inform the House who is to be the British representative on the International Commission. I would venture to express the hope that this country will be represented by our present Consul-General at Salonika, who is admirably fitted in every respect for such a task.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am not yet able to make a statement as to the selection of our representative. The reply to the first Question is—Yes, we shall lay further Papers on the Table.

RETIREMENT OF CAVALRY OFFICERS.

LORD HENEAGE: My Lords, I rise, in accordance with the notice standing in my name, to ask the Under-Secretary of State for War how many officers serving in cavalry regiments have resigned their commissions or sent in their resignations since the South African War; how many candidates have passed their examinations and received commissions in cavalry regiments during the same period; and what is the number of officers now required, exclusive of officers serving on the Staff or extra-regimental duty, to complete the establishment in all the cavalry regiments.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): My Lords, in reply to the Question I have to say that 321 cavalry officers have retired voluntarily or resigned their commissions since the South African War; 116 have in the same period received commissions in the cavalry—viz., seventy-nine from the Royal Military College, twenty-seven from the Militia, and ten from the Universities. The total number of vacancies at the present moment is sixty-five. To account for the apparent discrepancy in the figures, it must be remembered that when the war came to an end there was a large number of supernumerary officers throughout every branch of the service. I do not wish to anticipate the debate on this important subject which takes place next week, but I can assure the noble Lord that this is a matter which we consider of the highest importance. We have been, and are still, collecting evidence on the subject, and it is a question which is undergoing the earnest consideration of my colleagues on the Army Council.

ACCIDENTS TO SEAMEN.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise, in accordance with the notice standing in my name, to ask His Majesty's Government whether, having regard to the recommendations of a Departmental Committee to consider the extension of the Accident Compensation Acts, they have now framed their Bill extending accident compensation to seamen which the Merchant Service Guild have been informed by the Board of Trade was under consideration; and whether, in view of the fact that the master, who is subjected to similar risks, is the only member of a ship's crew who in the eyes of the law is not a seaman, and that the Merchant Shipping Act already adopts the principle of a shipowner's liability when a master is injured in the service of the ship, they have included, or will include, masters in the benefits arising from the Bill when sanctioned by Parliament.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Duke of MARLBOROUGH): My Lords, I can assure my noble friend, in reply to his Question, that the Board of Trade recognise the importance of this matter. The Bill concerning which he has asked for information has not yet been drafted, but the principle of dealing with the question by amendment of the Merchant Shipping Act has been approved of. When the measure is prepared the question of applying its provisions to masters as well as to seamen will be carefully and sympathetically considered.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Seven o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 18th July, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Earl of Stamford's Cheshire Estate Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Formby Township Bill [Lords]; Workington Harbour and Dock Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Thames Conservancy Bill. Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Wigan Corporation Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) (No. 2) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Blackpool Improvement Bill [Lords]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bristol Blind Asylum Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

Corbett Estate Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill, without Amendment.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill; Dublin United Tramways Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill; Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (BIBLE TEACHING IN STATE SCHOOLS).

Petition from Long Crendon, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

GROSS DEPARTMENTAL EXPENDITURE.

Return [presented 17th July] to be printed. [No. 243.]

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).

Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 29th June; *Captain Norton*]; to lie upon the Table.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES (DUBLIN).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th March; *Mr. Nannetti*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 244.]

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).

Copy presented, of Fourteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 245.]

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 634 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3440 and 3441 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF SIXTY-FIVE).

Copy ordered, "of Treasury Minute, dated the 17th day of July, 1905, stating the circumstances under which certain Civil Servants have been retained in the Service after they have attained the age of Sixty-five; and of the Return therein referred to."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) (RATES).

Return ordered, "showing the number of parishes within the Congested Districts in Scotland where the combined Rates amount to more than five shillings in the pound, the amount of the Rates in each case, and also the increase during the last twenty years."—(*Mr. John Dewar.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Sale of Obsolete Warships at Portsmouth—Names and Prices Realised.

Mr. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can give the names of the warships sold at Portsmouth on the 11th instant, and the price realised in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. Preyman.*) The names of the ships sold, and the prices realised, are as follows:—

	£
Orlando	10,000
Iris	8,000
Magicienne	6,000
Fearless	4,250
Blanche	4,000
Barrosa	4,250
Jaseur	2,075
Boomerang	1,900
Karrakatta	1,875
Grasshopper	1,425
Pelter	725
Fancy	460
Pincher	620
Enchantress	2,675
Lion	3,100
Myrtle	2,300
Hamadryad	1,000
Nautilus	860
Liberty	630

The following were subsequently sold by private treaty:—

	£
Hector	8,000
Beagle	4,500
Blonde	3,750

Post Office Staff.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state the total number of persons on the established staff of the Post Office, male and female; the total number of female staff, established; and the total number of persons, male and female, established or unestablished, who are under the age of twenty-one years.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The total number of persons on the established staff of the Post Office on March 31st last was 84,113, of whom 11,579 were females. In order to give the information asked for in the second part of the hon. Member's Question, it would be necessary to have a Return prepared of the ages of all the staff of the Post Office. This would involve considerable expense which would perhaps scarcely be justified.

Sheep Scab in Shropshire.

Mr. BRIGHT (Shropshire, Oswestry): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is aware that the changes of policy with regard to sheep scab have caused loss and inconvenience to Oswestry; that the loss of trade has been estimated at 1,000 to 1,100 sheep per week, and that it has been proposed to remove the sheep market from Oswestry to Llanrhaiadr; and whether he will take steps to remedy this state of things.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) I have received representations on this subject from the town council of Oswestry, and have been in communication respecting it with the county council of Salop, who are the local authority under the Diseases of Animals Acts. The district from which Oswestry mainly draws its supplies is undoubtedly a dangerous one from the point of view of sheep scab, and the county council consider that under existing conditions the holding of markets there for any undipped sheep brought from that district would be attended with considerable risk of the introduction and spreading of the disease. The arrangements made at the market were, moreover, not altogether of a satisfactory character. In these circumstances the county council have withdrawn the licence issued by them under the Sheep Scab (Regulation of Movement) Order, 1905, and I regret that I do not see my way to interfere with the discretion of the local authority in this respect.

Bovine Tuberculosis.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis has or will shortly report on the effect produced or disease set up by introducing into the body of the bovine animal material containing living tubercle bacilli of human and bovine origin respectively through the alimentary canal as distinct from effect when introduced by subcutaneous injection, and will urge an early Report on the third clause of the reference, viz., under what conditions, if at all, the transmission of the disease from animals to man takes place, and what are the circumstances favourable or unfavourable to such transmission as affecting food for man.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) As I stated in my reply to the hon. Member for the Eastern Division of Northants on the 9th May † last, I understand that the Royal Commission hope to issue a further Interim Report towards the end of the present year. I am informed that this Report will contain details of the different results obtained by various methods of infecting bovine and other animals with tubercle derived from different sources, but I understand that some considerable time must elapse before the Commission can issue a Report dealing with the third clause of the reference to them.

Diphtheria Outbreak at Norwood Poor Law Schools.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if, in view of the outbreak of diphtheria at the Norwood Poor Law Schools which has extended to sixty-one children, notwithstanding the care and skill taken for its prevention, he will consider the advisability of breaking up this aggregation of 500 children, in accordance with the recommendations of the Departmental Committee's Report of 1897.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) It appears to be doubtful whether there can properly be said to have been an outbreak of diphtheria at these schools in the sense in which that expression is ordinarily understood. I am informed that only three of the cases presented the ordinary clinical symptoms of the disease, and that in the remaining cases there had been no disturbance of the children's health, although the bacillus of diphtheria or some other bacillus resembling it had been discovered by bacteriological methods. It does not seem to be necessary to consider the advisability of breaking up the school.

Law of Treasure Trove in Wales.

MR. GEORGE KENYON (Denbigh Boroughs): To ask Mr. Attorney-General if his attention has been called to the verdict of the coroner's jury at Carnarvon on the subject of treasure trove; and whether, with a view to making clear the laws affecting treasure trove in the Principality, he will take the necessary steps to enable the police and others to circulate clearer information on the subject in Welsh and English.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) My attention has been called to the verdict of the coroner's jury on an inquiry as to the finding of certain coins at Carnarvon. Circulars were issued in 1886, by the Home Office, on the subject of treasure trove. The question whether any fresh circular shall be issued will receive the consideration of the Treasury.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxlv., 1342.

Promotion of Assistant Clerks in the Statistical Office, Custom House.

MR. JOSEPH HOWARD (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury to what positions assistant clerks in the statistical office, Custom House, can be promoted, in view of the fact that the Treasury letter of July 2nd, 1904, stated that the Lords of the Treasury strongly urged that ensuing vacancies for junior clerkships be filled from outside sources.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I would refer my hon. friend to the reply I gave on March 15th † last to the hon. Member for Galway South, in which I stated that assistant clerks in the Customs are eligible for occasional promotion, on the ground of exceptional merit, to the classes of—(1) Port clerks; (2) Junior clerks in the statistical office.

British Consulate at Algiers.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs during what hours is the British Consulate at Algiers open for the transaction of ordinary business connected with British shipping, without the payment of any fees beyond those officially tabulated; what extra fees for overtime are charged for business transacted during non-official hours in connection with British shipping; to what accounts are the ordinary and the extra fees respectively credited; what is the usual custom regarding the issue of bills of health to British steamers; and is it permissible to supply these in blank to shipbrokers to fill up at their discretion.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) His Majesty's Consul-General at Algiers will be instructed to report what the business hours of the Consulate-General are, and also what is the usual custom regarding the issue of bills of health to British steamers. For the transaction of any business for which a fee is leviable, for each half-hour in the day time, that is to say, between the hours of 6 a.m. and 9 p.m., not during the customary business hours of the place, a fee of 5s. is charged, of which the Consul retains one-half; for each half-hour at night, that is to say, between the hours of 9 p.m. and 6 a.m. a fee of 10s. is charged, of which the Consul retains four-fifths. Ordinary fees are credited to His Majesty's Government, as are also the remaining portions of the extra fees.

Export Bounties on Steel, Iron, and Coal from Rhenish Westphalian Mines.

SIR THOMAS WRIGHTSON (St. Pancras, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the circular issued by the Dortmund Clearing House intimating that it is authorised by the Coal Syndicate, the Dusseldorf and Siegerland Pig Iron Syndicates, and the Steel Syndicate, to grant bounties on iron and steel manufactures for the export market on the following basis for the second quarter: 1s. 6d. per ton on coal or coke, 4s. 10d. per ton on pig-iron, 15s. per ton on semi-finished basic steel, and 20s. per ton on shapes; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Bonar Law.*) I am aware that in March last the Clearing House of the Rhenish Westphalian Coal Syndicate and the Pig Iron and Steel Syndicates fixed the amounts of the export bounties to be paid to syndicated firms during the second quarter of the year approximately at the amounts stated in the Question. The system under which the Kartell bounties are granted is not new, and is described in Cd. 1761, of 1903, and Cd. 2337, of 1904. No action in the matter is proposed.

Monthly Circulation of Return of Passengers for Places out of Europe.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether he will circulate monthly, together with the Alien Immigration Monthly Return, the new Return of the number and nationalities of the passengers that leave the United Kingdom for places out of Europe; and whether he will include this new Return in the Board of Trade *Labour Gazette*.

(*Answered by Mr. Bonar Law.*) The new Return referred to has already been presented to the House, and the first number has been circulated. Future numbers will be circulated in due course, about the same time as the Alien Immigration

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxliii., 9.

Return. A summary of the information given in the Return is already published monthly in the Board of Trade *Labour Gazette*. (See page 221 of the July number.)

Revenue Derived in the United Kingdom from Taxation of Food and Drink.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the total amount of revenue derived in the United Kingdom from the taxation, both by Excise and Customs duties, on all kinds of food and drink, excluding spirits, beer, tea, and wine, during the last twenty years; and also state what this amount would represent per head of the population.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*)

Year ended 31st March.	Population of the United Kingdom.	Revenue derived from Duties on Articles of Food and Drink, excluding Spirits, Beer, Tea, and Wine.			Revenue per head of Population.		
		Customs.	Excise.	Total.			
		£	£	£	£	s.	d.
1886	36,015,601	839,182	2,537	841,719			5·6
1887	36,313,582	858,392	2,061	860,453			5·6
1888	36,599,143	882,208	1,744	883,952			5·7
1889	36,881,271	922,643	1,047	923,690			6·0
1890	37,178,929	867,272	1,509	868,781			5·6
1891	37,484,764	675,788	1,587	677,375			4·3
1892	37,802,381	697,215	1,630	698,845			4·4
1893	38,133,817	688,659	1,754	690,413			4·3
1894	38,489,806	693,418	834	694,252			4·3
1895	38,858,306	747,077	1,523	748,600			4·6
1896	39,220,114	746,467	651	747,118			4·5
1897	39,597,843	778,390	1,502	779,892			4·7
1898	39,985,831	806,411	1,366	807,777			4·8
1899	40,379,095	804,507	1,427	805,934			4·7
1900	40,772,365	872,841	1,133	873,974			5·1
1901	41,152,471	840,465	1,067	841,532			4·9
1902	41,550,773	7,271,608	65,673	7,337,281		3	6·3
1903	41,961,199	7,709,261	89,694	7,798,955		3	8·6
1904	42,371,216	6,799,504	84,637	6,884,141		3	2·9
1905	42,789,552	7,046,225	98,690	7,144,915		3	4·0

The Customs figures represent the duties on chicory and coffee, cocoa and chocolate, dried fruits, corn, grain, etc. (from April, 1902, to June 30th, 1903), and sugar, molasses, glucose, and articles containing sugar or other sweetening matter (dutiable since 1901). The Excise figures represent the duties on glucose, saccharin, and chicory of British manufacture.

Acquisition of Land in Calcutta by the Indian Government.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the notice of the intention of the Government of India to acquire certain areas in Council Street, Government Place, and Wellesley Place, Calcutta, for public purposes; whether the object of this acquisition is to find room for menial staff, band, and additional stable accommodation for the Viceroy during his residence in Calcutta, which is confined to a period of about four months only in each year; whether he is aware that the acquisition of these areas will displace several European firms which have been there carrying on business for over half a century, and inconvenience the European population of Calcutta by the closing of these places of business, and that there is no land in the immediate vicinity of the business part of Calcutta to which these displaced firms can remove; whether his attention has been drawn to the petition of the Calcutta Trades' Association of March 20th last, protesting against this interference with the business of the capital of India; and whether he will cause an inquiry to be instituted before the intended acquisition is carried into effect.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I have seen the notification of the intention of the Government of India to acquire the areas referred to in the Question. The objects stated in the notification are to provide offices for the Viceroy's private and military secretaries; residential quarters for officers, subordinates, and servants attached to His Excellency's staff, and for the Viceroy's band; a hospital and dispensary for the staff; furniture and camp equipment storerooms; and extension of stabling for Government House. I have seen in the newspapers correspondence on the subject, and I understand that the Calcutta Trades' Association have been informed, in reply to their representation of March 20th last, that the firms mentioned in their petition will be permitted to remain in occupation until the expiry of their leases. It is probable that the improvements now being carried out in Calcutta will eventually provide eligible sites to which they can remove when their leases expire. It does not appear necessary to institute an inquiry at the present stage.

Education of Children of Agricultural Labourers in Assam.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he proposes to allow the Commissioner of Assam to shelve the question of improved education for the children of labourers in tea gardens and otherwise in Assam for a year; and, if so, will he explain why; and, if this course is to be taken, is he aware that the State of Baroda affords more opportunities of primary education to its subjects than are offered in British-governed States.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I do not, as at present advised, propose to interfere with the discretion of the Chief Commissioner of Assam. I doubt if in any part of India, whether British territory or Native States, special facilities are accorded for the education of agricultural labourers in excess of those granted to the general population. In primary education generally Assam is not more backward than other provinces.

Military Camp on Evicted Farm at Clonaslee.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the military at present engaged in manœuvres in Queen's County are encamped on an evicted farm at Clonaslee; and, if so, can he state who is responsible for this fact; and, in view of the fact that the evicted tenant is seeking reinstatement under the Act of 1903, whether he will advise the military authorities to remove the camp and make compensation to the evicted tenant for damage.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The field firing camp at Clonaslee was hired through the agent to the persons on whose property the camp lies. The responsibility for troops being camped on part of an evicted farm does not rest with the military authorities, and it is not proposed either to remove the camp or to compensate the evicted tenant for damage.

Manufacture of the New Short Rifle.

Sir HENRY SETON-KARR (St. Helens): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can inform the House of the results of the recent trials of the new short rifle; whether its manufacture and issue is being proceeded with; and, if so, to what extent; and whether any further changes in its length and mechanisms have been decided on; and, if so, what they are.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The trials of the new short rifle are not yet completed. Manufacture is proceeding to complete the number ordered. In reply to the last part of the Question, no change has been decided on.

Redistribution—Appointment and Terms of Reference of Boundary Commission.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, before Parliament has determined the principles on which Redistribution should proceed, the Government propose to appoint Commissioners to report upon the revision of the boundaries of constituencies; and, if so, upon what rules those Commissioners will be instructed to act.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I trust that the hon. Gentleman will consider that in my Answers in the House this afternoon I dealt adequately with the subject of his Question.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Sale of Obsolete Warships at Portsmouth—Names and Prices Realised.

Mr. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can give the names of the warships sold at Portsmouth on the 11th inst., and the price realised in each case.

The SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The names of the ships sold, and the prices realised, are as follows:—

	£
Orlando	10,000
Iris	8,000
Magicienne	6,000
Fearless	4,250
Blanche	4,000
Barrosa	4,250
Jaseur	2,075
Boomerang	1,900
Karrakatta	1,875
Grasshopper	1,425
Pelter	725
Fancy	460
Pincher	620
Enchantress	2,675
Lion	3,100
Myrtle	2,300
Hamadryad	1,000
Nautilus	860
Liberty	630

The following were subsequently sold by private treaty:—

	£
Hector	8,000
Beagle	4,500
Blonde	3,750

The Admiralty and the Welsh Coalfields.

Sir LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can give the House any information with regard to the alleged sale o smokeless steam coal in Wales to a German syndicate.

Mr. PRETYMAN: Of course it is evident that no information on this point that I can give can be final or absolutely certain. But the information I possess leads me to believe that no such purchase has been completed, and it is extremely doubtful if any such purchase is likely.

The War Stores Inquiry.

Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government were aware, when framing the War Stores Commission Bill, that an officer cannot be tried or punished for any offence triable by Court-martial committed more than three years before the date at which his trial begins; and how the Government proposes to deal with any officer amenable under the Army Act for any offence arising out of the dealings with the stores in South Africa in 1902.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The hon. Gentleman asked me a Question the other day as to why the Government did not, in introducing their Bill on this subject, make provision for the trial of officers by Court-martial. I answered him at the time that that would be wholly outside the provisions of the Bill and quite inconsistent with its general character. I now gather that he wants to know whether there would be any possibility of punishing these officers should the inquiries of the Commission last so long that the three years would have elapsed before the Commission had reached the term of their investigation. If these officers had done anything which would justify their dismissal from the service, they can be dismissed from the service. If it was thought desirable to have a Court-martial I believe a special Ordinance could be passed to that effect. If they had made any infraction of the criminal law of the country they can be brought to trial. There is every provision, it seems to me, which can be desired for punishing the guilty.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE: Would the special Ordinance over-rule the statutory enactment?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no statutory enactment.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE said it was statutory, because no officer could be tried by Court-martial for an offence committed three years before the date of the trial.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not think it was statutory, but asked that a Question should be put down. He would remind the hon. Member that his criticism of his Answer did not affect the assertion that it would always be possible to dismiss an officer.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE asked how the Government proposed to deal with breaches of military discipline which were not provided for in consequence of neglect to produce the evidence at the proper time.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If it is proved that an officer has committed acts unworthy of an officer and a gentleman, of course he can be dismissed.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE: Without trial?

[No Answer was returned.]

Army Bayonet Contracts.

MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it has been the practice in the past, whether formulated or not, to give out to private firms one-half of the bayonets required for the service of the Army; and, if so, will he say why this practice is now being departed from.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): When orders for bayonets have been sufficient to warrant it, they have been divided equally between the trade and the Ordnance Factories. This year the number of bayonets required is so small that it is necessary to confine the larger proportion of the orders to the Ordnance Factories.

MR. J. F. HOPE: I shall call attention to this matter when a suitable opportunity offers.

War Office Land Purchase in the Kyles of Bute.

MR. DOBBIE (Ayr Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any purchase of land for military purposes has recently been made, or is in course of being completed, in the Kyles of Bute, or elsewhere in Argyllshire; and, if so, if he will state the extent of same, the name of seller, and the price paid.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The War Department has agreed to purchase an area of land at Ardhallow, Dunoon, Argyllshire, in connection with purposes of defence. The area consists of 1 acre, 2 roods, 39 poles, and right of way thereto and way leave for cables. The owner is Mr. Campbell Wyndham, and the price agreed is £660, including compensation to tenant.

MR. DOBBIE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say for what purpose the land is required?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: In connection, I believe, with the position-finding station at Ardhallow.

Army Vaccine Institute.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state what quantity of glycerinated calf lymph is produced annually in the Army Vaccine Institute; the number of calves operated on; and whether they are sold for human food or utilised in the military kitchens.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The annual average amount of glycerinated calf lymph produced at the Army and Navy Vaccine Institute is sufficient to vaccinate 126,280 persons, and the average annual number of calves operated on thirty. The calves are slaughtered and post-mortem examinations made in each case before the carcasses are sold to the public. They are not utilised in military kitchens.

MR. WEIR: I wanted to get at the number of tubes sent out.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Question does not ask that.

Mr. Van Rensburg.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): On behalf of the junior Member for Halifax, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that at the first meeting, in Heidelberg, of creditors in the insolvent estate of Mr. Van Rensburg, who recently resigned his seat as a nominated member of the Inter-Colonial Council, debts to the amount of £51,000 were proved, and included in the list was a sum of £20,000 due to the Colonial Treasurer of the Transvaal; and can he say for what purpose this loan was made.

MR. TREVELYAN: On behalf of the junior Member for Halifax, I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can say on what date the Colonial Treasurer of the Transvaal made the loan of £20,000 to Mr. Van Rensburg; for what consideration the loan was made; whether there is any probability of the money being recovered; and also will he inquire if this is the same Mr. Van Rensburg whose telegram was quoted by the Government in debate in this House on February 17th, 1904, as evidence that the Boers were in favour of Chinese labour.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): The information I have now received is that a loan of £10,000 was made by the South African Republic to Mr. Van Rensburg upon first mortgage bond in 1898. A further loan of £5,000 was made by the present Government in 1903 upon another first mortgage bond; both fully secured on farms in Heidelberg district. Later on the original loan was increased to £15,000 to enable Mr. Van Rensburg to redeem the first bond referred to with arrears of interest on same amounting to £3,000, and to repair damage done during the war. The total of his present capital indebtedness, viz., £20,000, is less than 50 per cent. of the valuation of the farms hypothecated. The Government are therefore fully secured. It is the same Mr. Van Rensburg whose telegram is printed at page 24 of Cd. 1941.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Will the right hon. Gentleman say what was the occasion of the grant of this loan, made by the public authorities to a private individual?

MR. LYTTELTON: I have no information as to what the ground of the loan by the Boer authorities was. The loan by the Government was for the purpose I have just stated.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: But there was another loan of £5,000—

an intermediate loan. And, besides that, can the right hon Gentleman explain why the public authorities of the Transvaal should interfere between this man and his debts?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have no further information than that which I have given, but if the right hon. Gentleman will put down a Question I will endeavour to get him an Answer.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) asked whether this was the same Mr. Rensburg whose authority was quoted by the right hon. Gentleman as "a representative and influential Boer."

Mr. LYTTELTON: He was quoted as a member of the Dutch community there, and the fact that he has been a mortgagee does not, I think, incapacitate him from being called in evidence.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland) asked whether it was the practice of the Transvaal Government to lend public money to private individuals in this way.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The hon. Gentleman had better put down a Question.

Punishment of Chinese on the Rand Mines.

Mr. BURT (Morpeth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can give the number of Chinese on the Rand mines who have been sent to prison up to the end of June, and the offences for which they were imprisoned; whether there are any interpreters in the prisons who can communicate between the Chinese prisoners and the prison authorities; and whether he can give the total number of Chinese who have been repatriated, and the reasons for their repatriation.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have not yet received returns for May and June. The returns from June, 1904, up to 30th April, 1905, show that 1,187 Chinese have been sent to prison; of these 243 for fourteen days or less. The offences were assault, riot, desertion, absence without leave, refusal to work, and theft. I am informed that there are no Chinese interpreters in the prisons, but that services of such can be obtained when required by application to foreign labour department. The numbers of labourers repatriated under Section 25 of Labour Importation Ordinance for refusing to perform service is one; under Section 26—(a) as permanently incapacitated for work by physical infirmity or disease, 1,183; (b) after conviction of offence and sentenced to imprisonment without option of fine, eighteen; total, 1,202.

Precautions against Riots on the Rand Mines

Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will furnish the House with copies of correspondence and other Papers relating to the negotiations between the Chamber of Mines at Johannesburg and the Government, as the result of which two troops of constabulary are to be stationed in the East and West Rand to assist the authorities in coping with disturbances among the Chinese; and whether he will take steps to secure that the cost of this arrangement shall be borne by the mine-owners concerned.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have not received any such correspondence, but I am making inquiry as to the alleged arrangement.

The Flogging of Chinese Coolies on the Rand Mines.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is satisfied that his assurance to the Chinese Minister, of 15th February, 1904 [Cd. 1945], that corporal punishment would not be legally inflicted upon indentured Chinese coolies by any employer or his servant, is being carried out; and whether, in the cases of flogging of coolies reported to the House on Thursday last, he is satisfied that the law of the colony, which prescribes that no sentence of whipping imposed by a magistrate can be carried out till the record has been sent to and the sentence confirmed by the Judge of the Supreme Court, has been also respected.

Mr. LYTTELTON: My attention has been drawn to a statement made by the late compound manager of the Crœsus

Mine, from which it would appear that illegal flogging has taken place on that mine, and I have been also informed by the hon. Member for Morpeth, whose fairness of view I freely acknowledge, that he has been satisfied by a trustworthy correspondent that this statement is correct. The practice is one which must, of course, be put down, and I am in communication with Lord Selborne, who is quite alive to the importance of the matter, with a view to further improvements in supervision. I may mention that the Transvaal Government has recently obtained from the Foreign Office the loan of the services of Mr. Jamieson as superintendent, and his intimate knowledge of the Northern Chinese and of their language will be of great value to the Colonial Government. With regard to the latter part of the Question, I have no reason to suppose that the law is not being adhered to.

DR. MACNAMARA: Do I understand that the Answer to the former part of the Question shows that the Colonial Secretary is not assured that the pledge to the Chinese Minister has been respected?

MR. LYTTELTON: I have answered the Question, and the hon. Gentleman may draw any inference he pleases.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): Was it not stated at a coroner's inquest recently that the Chinese miners were repeatedly flogged and assaulted, and when complaint was made to the mine manager no notice was taken of it?

MR. LYTTELTON: I have not seen that.

Disposal of Police Court Fines.

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state how fines levied in Courts of summary jurisdiction are disposed of; and what proportion, if any, is paid to county rates or police funds.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): Fines imposed by Courts of summary jurisdiction, unless specially appropriated by the Act under which they are imposed or some amending Act, are paid into local funds, *i.e.*, into county or borough funds as the case may be. In London they are paid into the Metropolitan Police Courts Fund. A table appended to the last issue of the Judicial Statistics shows the amounts paid over under this system. In 1903, £144,258 was paid into county, borough, and Police Court funds; £42,886 to the police; £5,628 to the Exchequer; and £25,703 to other persons.

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU: Could not a portion of the fines inflicted on motor-car drivers be devoted to abating the dust nuisance?

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS replied in the negative.

The Postmaster-General and the Postal Staff.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he received, on Thursday, 6th July, a protest from the staff of telegraphists then on duty at the Central Telegraph Office respecting his charges made on that day against Post Office employees; whether he sent any reply; and, if so, will he state its terms; and, if he did not send a reply, whether he will take an early opportunity of removing the irritation which has been caused by his statement.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I received on the evening of Thursday the 6th instant an anonymous telegram purporting to convey a request from the staff on duty at the Central Telegraph Office. I am not aware in what way the sender of that telegram was authorised to represent the views of that staff. I did not send a reply. The hon. Gentleman may not have noticed that in replying to a Question of the hon. Member for King's Lynn I expressly stated that my remarks to which he refers did not apply to the whole of the staff, and I have since repeated that statement on a public platform. They applied only to those who by speeches, letters, or circulars, attempt unduly to influence the votes of hon. Members with regard to the questions affecting Post Office wages, and to those who associate themselves with such action. I see nothing to reconsider or to modify further in my remarks; and I can only suggest that the best way of removing the irritation is for those men to desist from conduct which the House I am sure condemns, and which, I think, entirely justified the epithets I applied to it.

Dr. MACNAMARA: Do I understand that the noble Lord persists in his charge against certain Post Office employees, that they are guilty of blackmail and bloodsucking?

Lord STANLEY: I have nothing to add to the Answer I have already given.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): Is the noble Lord aware that a bloodsucker is a public curse?

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): May I ask whether, in order to avoid the necessity for issuing such circulars, the noble Lord will consent to receive officials of the union to negotiate disputes on behalf of the men.

Lord STANLEY: No, Sir.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Will the noble Lord try the experiment of working for a guinea a week and keeping a wife and family on it?

Dr. MACNAMARA: Will the noble Lord consent to receive the representatives of the men, and give them an opportunity of repudiating the suggestion?

Lord STANLEY: No, Sir.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): Will the noble Lord either withdraw or modify his language?

Lord STANLEY: No. I will neither modify nor withdraw anything I have said.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Does not the noble Lord consider the slander on these men an insult to the Members of Parliament who support their claims? I have voted for them——

Lord STANLEY: Under pressure?

Mr. DELANY: And I take it as an insult.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: Are not the bloodsuckers the Ministers who, in spite of public opinion being against them, stick to office and draw high salaries?

[No Answer was returned.]

Post Office Savings Bank Withdrawals.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the new system of withdrawal from the Post Office Savings Bank, under which sums not exceeding £1 are paid at any savings bank post office on the evidence of balance as disclosed in a depositor's book, affords facilities for frauds; and, seeing that it is open to a forger to open accounts at a cost of 1s. each at any of the 15,000 offices in the United Kingdom and obtain payment of £1 at any other office after having manipulated a false entry in the deposit book, will he consider the expediency of introducing a system of payment on demand by means of withdrawal orders secured from the head office, and not on the mere evidence of balance contained in a deposit book.

Lord STANLEY: The system of withdrawals on demand of sums not exceeding £1 was introduced after full consideration of all the risks involved. If fraud were attempted, the safeguards provided would ensure speedy detection. The system of payment by means of withdrawal orders which the hon. Member wishes to see adopted has frequently been brought under the notice of the Post Office; but in addition to the fact that it would entail considerable expense, it is altogether unsuited to the system of account-keeping in use in the Post Office Savings Bank.

Mr. WEIR: If the noble Lord will consult with his colleagues, the Attorney-General and the Home Secretary, and secure me exemption from prosecution, I shall be able to prove to him by actual experiment, that frauds under the new system of withdrawal may be successfully operated on a gigantic scale. The so called safeguard only proves a fraud has been committed, but in no way assists detection of the culprit.

West Indian Mail Service.

MR. LAMONT (Buteshire): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he proposes to make any arrangements for the conveyance of the West Indian Mails; and, if so, whether such mails will be carried as hitherto under contract, or without a subsidy and under postal union rates.

LORD STANLEY: I propose to forward mails to the West Indies by the most favourable opportunities that offer. I am not at present negotiating for their conveyance under any fresh contract. Payment for correspondence sent by private steamers will be made at the ordinary ship letter rates, and the payment for parcels will vary according to their weights.

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether he has noticed the announcement that the promoters of the Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company have commenced to buy up electrical undertakings throughout London; and whether it is necessary that agreements of sale made with a local authority possessing authorised electrical undertakings should be submitted to the Board of Trade before they are confirmed by the local authority; whether the Board of Trade has seen and approved of the agreements that have been made by the company with the Barking and Bexley Urban District Councils, and what is the nature of these arrangements; whether the agreement with Stepney involves the ultimate acquisition of the electrical undertaking of that council; and whether he is aware of any further negotiations having been concluded with other London boroughs.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. BONAR LAW, Glasgow, Blackfriars): I have not noticed the announcement that the company have commenced to buy up electrical undertakings throughout London, nor have I any information as to the particulars of the agreements or negotiations referred to in the Question. I understand that the Bill as at present drawn provides that no agreement for the sale of an undertaking shall be of force until it has received the approval of the Board of Trade, but until the Bill has received Royal Assent no case can be submitted to or considered by the Board of Trade.

MR. LOUGH: Is there a provision in the Act of 1888 that no undertaking in London shall be bought up without the consent of the Board of Trade, and has such consent been applied for in any case?

MR. BONAR LAW: There is such a provision, but no application has been made under it.

The Harcourt Memorial.

SIR W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley whether the First Commissioner of Works is prepared to assist in giving facilities for the erection of a statue as a memorial to the late Sir William Harcourt within the precincts of the Palace of Westminster.

*LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire Chorley): A proposal has been made that the memorial shall take the form of a statue to be placed on one of the eight vacant pedestals in the lobby of the House of Commons. The First Commissioner is anxious to do all in his power to meet the views of the Harcourt Memorial Committee, so far as the limited space in the Palace of Westminster permits.

Big Ben.

*COLONEL LEGGE St. (George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether, for the better guidance of Members, he will cause a red light to be displayed on the port face of the clock corresponding to the green light now exhibited on the starboard face.

*Mr. J. F. HOPE asked whether, instead of adding a red light to the green, the hon. Member would no longer suffer the countenance of the clock to wear the aspect of incipient nausea.

*Lord BALCARRES: May I be allowed to give the Answer as drafted by the Department? The First Commissioner regrets that he is unable to adopt the suggestion of my hon. and gallant friend. The green light now exhibited has been installed for the purposes of experiment, it being anticipated that a very large saving of current might be effected by its use; there is no reason to suppose the use of a red light would have any similar advantage.

Mr. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrincham) asked by what authority the First Commissioner of Works touched the clock. The clock tower was the property of the House of Commons.

*Lord BALCARRES: There is a small apartment in the clock tower which, I believe, is placed under the control of the Serjeant-at-Arms from time to time. The First Commissioner of Works has complete control over the entire fabric, including the clock.

Mr. LOUGH: What is the estimated saving by the use of the green light?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Notice must be given of that Question.

Liscard Institution, Liverpool.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if he will state what progress has been made with the scheme for training boys in seamanship at Liscard Institution, Liverpool; how many boys have been admitted; and from what districts do they come.

The LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton): Though the Congested Districts Board sent full information throughout the congested area, the response has been disappointing. Only three applications were made, one from Lewis for a boy over age, one from Embo and one from Brora in Sutherland, which are now before the Liscard authorities.

Aberdeen Educational Trust Home for Training Girls.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether the home for the training of girls in connection with the Aberdeen Educational Trust has yet been opened; if so, will he state how many girls have been admitted, and from what districts they come; and will he state how many applications for admission have been received up to the present time.

Mr. SCOTT DICKSON: The Aberdeen Committee will be unable to open the home before the beginning of August. Twenty-seven applications have been received. Offers of admittance have been sent to nineteen of them. Seven have accepted, seven have refused, and five have not yet replied. Offers were made to eleven in Lewis, two in mainland of Ross, three in Barra, and three in Sutherland.

Motor Fishing Boats for Ireland.

Mr. BOLAND (Ke ry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Congested Districts Board for Scotland has acquired an experimental motor fishing boat; and whether the Congested Districts Board for Ireland or the fisheries branch of the Department of Agriculture will undertake similar experiments.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.): It is understood that motor fishing boats have not, so far, proved satisfactory in Great Britain. The Irish Departments referred to consider it desirable, therefore, to await the result of the experiment now being conducted by the Congested Districts Board for Scotland.

Dundonald Cemetery.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that at a meeting of the Belfast Corporation, held on 6th July, a charge of altering the terms of a resolution passed by the cemetery committee with reference to the allocation of ground for Catholic burials in Dundonald

Cemetery was made by members of the corporation; and that the alteration referred to was intended to have the effect of depriving the Catholic authorities of Belfast of the right of authorising interments in that portion of the cemetery allotted to Catholics; will he say who was responsible for the altering of the resolution, and whether the proceedings at the meeting referred to were null and void; and whether, in view of the importance of the whole question to the Catholics of Belfast, he will order that a special inquiry with power to examine witnesses on oath be held with regard to it.

MR. WALTER LONG: I have seen a newspaper report of the proceedings of the corporation, which shows that a charge of the nature indicated was made. The Local Government Board have no power to intervene in regard to the charge referred to. The only matter for them to determine is the allotment of the burial ground amongst the various religious denominations.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): Has the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Belfast any authority over graves paid for by private individuals?

MR. WALTER LONG: I do not see how that has any connection with the Question.

MR. SLOAN: The connection is this——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice had better be given of any further Question.

Clonaslee Evicted Tenant.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether a claim for reinstatement has been received by the Estates Commissioners on behalf of the representatives of an evicted tenant named Talbot, on the estate of Dunnes Minors, Clonaslee, Queen's County; whether the present occupant of the farm is a brother of the late owner of the estate; and what steps have been taken towards reinstatement in this case.

MR. WALTER LONG: The application has been received, but, in the absence of any proceedings for the sale of the estate, the Commissioners have taken no action upon it.

MR. DELANY: Will the Commissioners advise this landlord to give up the farm to the rightful owner—the evicted tenant?

MR. WALTER LONG: The Commissioners have no power to advise the landlord.

Wicklow Evicted Tenants.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state how many applications the Estates Commissioners have received from evicted tenants in the county of Wicklow for reinstatement in their farms; if he can give the names and addresses of the applicants; whether any of them have been restored to their former holdings or to other holdings; and, if so, how many.

MR. WALTER LONG: Fifty-five applications have been received, and reinstatement has taken place in one case, I do not consider it either necessary or desirable to give the names and addresses of the applicants.

Lord Lansdowne's Evicted Tenants.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether a claim for reinstatement has been received by the Estates Commissioners from James Byrne, representative of the late Margaret Byrne Tully, who was evicted from a farm of 189 acres on Lord Lansdowne's estate, Luggacurran, Queen's County, in April, 1887; and will he say what steps, if any, are being taken towards the reinstatement of the evicted tenant's representative in this case.

MR. WALTER LONG: Mrs. Byrne's former holding, which is occupied by another tenant, is not situated on that portion of the estate which is now being dealt with by the Commissioners, and they are, therefore, unable at present to entertain the application for reinstatement.

Mr. DELANY: How are the Commissioners prepared to deal with this estate? Will they see that Mr. Byrne gets, at any rate, the equivalent of the farm?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I cannot say how the Commissioners are prepared to deal with any estate. I can only tell the hon. Member what they have done and what they are doing.

Mr. FLAVIN: How many of the tenants evicted by Lord Lansdowne have been reinstated by him under the policy of conciliation?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Notice must be given of that.

Administration of the Land Purchase Act.

Mr. LOUGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the fact that the rate of progress at which agreements for sale under the Land Purchase Act, 1903, are being made makes it clear that the anticipation that twenty years would be required to complete the transfer of Irish land was excessive, and having regard to the urgency of the situation and the appeals that have been addressed to the Government by representatives of landlords and tenants, whether he intends, before the session closes, to place sufficient funds at the disposal of the Estates Commissioners, or to take any other steps, such as offering stock at market value to vendors who may be willing to take such in payment, or by any other means to meet the difficulty.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): Can the right hon. Gentleman also tell the House what financial measures are being adopted to remove the block in the Land Judge's Court?

Mr. WALTER LONG: This matter has engaged my anxious consideration, and I have formulated a proposal in alleviation of the present situation which I will explain at length in Committee of Supply on Thursday next.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) asked whether this would involve any legislation.

Mr. WALTER LONG replied that it might be necessary to secure a small Amendment of the Land Act, which imposed an obligation that the landlord should be paid in one form only. If his plan was adopted it would be necessary to give an option in this matter.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND gave notice that, so long as the new regulations which had been issued by the Government were in force, he should oppose by every means in his power any such proposal.

Mr. LOUGH asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he could give any outline of his plans.

Mr. WALTER LONG: No, Sir. I do not think I can go any further than I have done.

Blackditches (Wicklow) Evicted Tenant.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the Estates Commissioners have received from Mrs. Cullen, a tenant evicted years ago from her farm at Blackditches, on the county Wicklow estate of the Marquess of Waterford, an application for reinstatement, or for another farm; and, if so, what action, if any, have the Commissioners taken in this case.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The Commissioners have received Mrs. Cullen's application and have informed her that they cannot interfere with the present occupant of her former holding, but that in the event of the estate coming before them her application will be considered.

Cragg and Ardcrone Farms, Kerry.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the date of the purchase by the Congested Districts Board of the Cragg and Ardcrone Farms, county Kerry, the purpose for which the lands were acquired, and the use made of the farms by the Board up to the present time.

Mr. WALTER LONG: I answered each of these inquiries in reply to the hon. Member's Question of April 4th † last.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxliv., 318.

MR. MURPHY: What use is being made of the farms at present?

MR. WALTER LONG: I stated the other day that the Congested Districts Board were using them for migration purposes. They are doing their best to convert uneconomic into economic holdings—though the process may be a slow one.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the farms are now being merely used for grazing purposes?

MR. WALTER LONG: The Board can only carry out its policy by degrees, and it surely is not necessary that farms should be derelict all the time the operation is going on.

Irish Poor Law Commission.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many counties or portions of counties have yet to be inquired into by the Poor Law Commission; and whether he can state about what time the Poor Law Commission will make their Report.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Commissioners have yet to hold local inquiries at Cork, Bantry, and Mallow. They hope to present their Report towards the close of the present year.

Boyle Disturbances.

MR. DISRAELI: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the circumstances of an attack at the house of a Mr. Magennis, near Boyle, county Roscommon; and whether he is aware that volleys of shots were fired at the house by men concealed in the shrubbery, Mr. Magennis and his men replying with revolver and gun shots; and, seeing that the attack lasted between two and three hours, whether he can state how many persons were injured, and whether the police have as yet made any arrests.

MR. WALTER LONG: I have received police reports as to this occurrence. The police are pursuing their investigation, and until the matter has been thoroughly sifted it would be premature to make any detailed announcement upon it. I may, however, state that none of the inmates of the house were injured, but glass in three windows was broken. No arrests have been made.

MR. DISRAELI: Am I to understand that after three hours fighting no arrests were made?

MR. WALTER LONG: "Fighting" involves the presence of two parties, and in this case the second party has not yet been discovered.

MR. DELANY: Will the right hon. Gentleman send to the hon. Gentleman who put this Question a copy of his statement that Questions put in this House should not be founded on statements in the "yellow" Press?

[No Answer was returned.]

Kerry Assizes.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of criminal cases tried and the sentences passed by Lord Justice Holmes at the Kerry Assizes during the present month; and also, whether he can state what is the condition of the county of Kerry.

MR. WALTER LONG: One case, in which a sentence of twenty-four hours imprisonment was passed. The prisoner had been in custody for three months. The county is on the whole in a fairly satisfactory condition, but I regret to say that it is still necessary to afford police protection to twenty-two persons as the result of agrarian disputes. Twelve of these persons are receiving constant protection.

Land Purchase Agreements.

MR. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the decision of Mr. Justice Meredith in the case of King-Harman, landlord, Hayes, tenant, under Section 5 of the Land Act, 1903, to the effect that the Estates Commissioners had no power to inspect the holding to inquire into the equity of the price as between landlord and tenant, and of the fact that in the case mentioned the Commissioners reported that the lands were only value for £460 but that the agreed price was £571, he will take steps to enable the Commissioners to inquire as to the value of holdings sold in order to prevent prices being paid beyond the value of the holding.

Mr. WALTER LONG: From the report of the case in the *Irish Law Times*, the effect of the judgment would appear to be that when an agreement has been entered into between a landlord and tenant for the sale of a holding at a certain price, both parties desiring that the sale shall be carried out, and the security to the State being adequate, the Estates Commissioners have no power under Section 5 to treat the two parties as incapable of entering into a valid contract and to refuse to approve of the agreement, except in cases in which a Court of Equity would interfere. The Government have no power to direct the Commissioners to put a particular construction on any provision of the statute, or to act in violation of its declared meaning.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to prevent land being sold at excessively high rates?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I have every confidence that the Estates Commissioners will look after this matter.

Dublin Probate Court—The Clerk of the Seat.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that in the Probate Court, Dublin, there is a functionary known as the "clerk of the seat," whose annual salary is £439 4s.; whether he can give the name of this employee; whether he can state what his duties are; how many days in the year, and for how many hours each day he is engaged in the discharge of his duties; and whether he is entitled to a pension.

*The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): There is no longer any such office in the Principal Probate Registry. The corresponding place is now filled by Mr. Marrable, a first-class clerk. His salary, like that of other-first class clerks, is £350—£15—£450, and he has reached his maximum salaryof £450. His duties are concerned with the grants of Probate and Letters of Administration. He is engaged on his duties during the whole year with the exception of the vacation of two months which is allowed to the clerks under the Act 22–23 Vic. cap. 31, sec. 31, and the public holidays as set forth in Order 63 (4) of the Rules of the Supreme Court, Ireland, 1905. He is entitled to a pension. The office hours are 11 to 4 ordinarily and 11 to 2 during the long vacation.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: In whose gift is this appointment?

*Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I must ask for notice of that Question.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: What is the meaning of "clerk of the seat?"

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: That has been explained in my Answer.

Signatures in Irish on Postal Orders.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the postal officials in Castlerea refused, on June 26th, to cash a postal order presented by Mr. Tomas O'Heidhin because he signed his name in Irish and in Irish characters; that they also refused, on the same date, to issue a money order for £5 to him, because he refused to sign the application form otherwise than Tomas O'Heidhin; whether his attention has been drawn to the matter already; and whether, in view of the fact that Mr. O'Heidhin has been for the past eight months teacher of Irish in the parish and is well known to the postal officials, he will issue instructions to this post office to cash the postal order when next presented by Mr. O'Heidhin.

Lord STANLEY: I am investigating the case referred to by the hon. Member, and will communicate the result to him.

Supply of Electricity Bill.

Mr. LOUGH: Having regard to the fact that the Supply of Electricity Bill is urgently needed, may I ask if the Government intend to take it up?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he understood this measure was not uncontroversial, and, if so, there was little hope of its passing this session.

MR. LOUGH: There is no Amendment down to it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is not a sure index of the absence of opposition. I cannot say more than I have done.

Redistribution—Government Method of Procedure.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham): I beg to ask whether, in view of the withdrawal of the Redistribution Resolutions, the Prime Minister intends to defer the appointment of the Boundary Commission until the Bill is introduced and the principle accepted by the House of Commons next session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If my hon. friend's Question means, as I suppose it does, whether I shall defer the investigation by a Committee or Commission, as the case may be, until we meet again next session, my Answer must be quite distinctly in the negative.

*SIR. J. DICKSON-PONDER: Will the instruction the right hon. Gentleman will give to the Boundary Commission be based on the proposals which have been withdrawn from the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think I can give an Answer to the hon. Gentleman, and I certainly should not be disposed to limit the labours of the Committee or Commission if I thought that by extending their scope information useful to the House when we introduce the Bill would be obtained.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Is there any precedent for a Boundary Commission, or anything in the nature of a Boundary Commission, being appointed except under the authority of Parliament, except in a case where there is an agreement in the House of Commons on the subject?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not aware, though I may be wrong, of any precedent to the contrary. I do not remember any case where the contrary course, of having a Parliamentary mandate to appoint a Commission, was followed.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Commissioners are named in the Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think the right hon. Gentleman quite apprehends my meaning. In the case, for example, of the first Reform Bill of 1831, Lord Russell, or the Government of the day, did put the names of the Commissioners in that Bill, and so far asked for Parliamentary powers. But the Bill was thrown out in the Lords, and Lord Russell, I think very properly, proceeded to appoint the Commissioners without the authority of Parliament.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: He had the authority of the House of Commons.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: They asked the authority of Parliament, but they did not get it. As far as I can remember, Mr. Gladstone's investigations in 1866, under Lord Russell's Government, were carried on without Parliamentary authority. As far as I remember, in 1867 Mr. Disraeli brought in Resolutions which did ask for House of Commons' authority, but he withdrew his Resolutions, and I believe that such investigations as he desired to carry out were carried out without the mandate of Parliament. In 1884 Mr. Gladstone, before the concordat—though I do not see what constitutional effect a concordat has or could have—appointed what he called a Committee to look into these questions of Redistribution. There was then a concordat, and then Parliament was summoned together, and then he announced to Parliament, in introducing his Redistribution Act of 1884, which ultimately became law, that the Commission had been some time at work and had made, if I remember aright, important advances in their labours.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): The statement of the right hon. Gentleman is hardly correct.

The Commission was not actually appointed until after the agreement had been come to between the two Parties.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. The Commission was not appointed, but the Committee was. If my memory serves me right, the Committee consisted of three members, to whom two were added, and they formed the Commission.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What we are anxious to get at is this. Of course we should all agree that the right hon. Gentleman may make any inquiry or investigation he likes if he is proposing this course merely for the purpose of obtaining a little more information upon this subject than he appears at present to enjoy. But such a Committee is a different thing from an authoritative body giving an authoritative Report which is to be used as a weapon—if I may employ the phrase—to compel the House of Commons to agree to a certain course in the session when the Bill is introduced.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no such thing as an authoritative weapon; nor is this House to be intimidated, I take it, by the Report of any Commission, however constituted or by whom appointed. When a Bill is introduced dealing with Redistribution, it would be very desirable that the House should have all the information at the disposal of the Government; but that the House would be coerced by that information to carry out the recommendations of the Commission is wholly inconsistent with our tradition; and is a chimerical fear which no man need entertain.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether it is his intention that the Bill of next session should be substantially on the same lines as the Resolution with which we have just parted, and whether the limit of 18,500 is to be maintained?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That will, of course, in part depend upon the information we derive between this and the introduction of the Bill next session.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): Which of the precedents the Prime Minister has quoted does he intend to follow?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: One of the precedents I propose to follow is Mr. Gladstone's precedent, in which he said nothing whatever to the House of Commons on the subject.

MR. DALZIEL: Why with these precedents before him did the right hon. Gentleman bring forward the Redistribution Resolution at all?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It would have been extremely inconvenient both to the House and the country if the general lines on which the Government based their policy had not been made public and the subject of general criticism.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Then these, *mutatis mutandis*, are generally the lines upon which the right hon. Gentleman will proceed?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not quite sure that I know what *mutatis mutandis* means in this connection. I certainly propose that any Committee which we may appoint shall start with a general knowledge of the views by which the Government have reached the proposals which they have submitted to the House. Whether those views will suffer any change in the course of the investigation by the Committee is a thing which it is impossible to foresee at the present moment.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): Is the House to understand that the Committee or the Commission which the Government propose to appoint is to be appointed without the instructions to them being made public.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Mr. Gladstone made no public announcement. I do not know that I am bound to follow Mr. Gladstone's precedent, but there is a great deal to be said for it.

Irish Representation in the British Parliament.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, before assenting to the Redistribution Resolutions, it had been brought to his knowledge that Mr. Pitt, when asked what guarantee the Irish people had that the British Parliament would not violate its pledges, replied publicly that Ireland had the guarantee of the honour of England; and whether, now that this declaration has been brought to his knowledge, he can say whether it is intended to persevere with the proposal to reduce the Irish representation below the figure fixed by the Act of Union.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not agree with the hon. Gentleman's view with regard to the character of the obligations imposed by the Treaty of Union; but it would really be quite impossible to argue the subject across the floor of the House at Question time.

MR. MACVEAGH asked whether, before the right hon. Gentleman drafted his Redistribution Resolutions, Mr. Pitt's reply was brought to his attention.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked whether the Prime Minister agreed with Mr. Pitt.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I agree with Mr. Pitt that nothing this House is likely to do will interfere with the honour of England.

Redistribution Anomalies.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he is aware that under his proposed scheme seven British county constituencies, *i.e.*, Bute 18,641, Rutland 19,719, Radnor 23,821, Sutherland 21,239, Peebles and Selkirk 19,106, Berwick 30,793, and Flint 21,559, making a total population of 154,868, will return seven Members of Parliament, whereas the county of Dublin, with a population of over 2,000 more than the above total, is only given two Members; and whether, in view of the disparity in the population of these Parliamentary constituencies, he will revise the proposed distribution of seats in accordance with more equitable principles.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman has pointed out that under the Bill of the Government there would be disparities, and there would always be disparities in any measure not based upon equal electoral areas. That proposition does not require proving, I accept it, it is undoubtedly true; but I do not think it a conclusive argument against the proposals of the Government.

MR. MOONEY: But will not the Bill create further electoral disparities?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, the hon. Gentleman has not proved that it would create electoral disparities. It would leave some electoral disparities untouched.

Kincardineshire and Redistribution.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that at present the population of Kincardineshire is 39,846, and the average population of the two seats in the neighbouring borough of Aberdeen is 71,864; and that under the Redistribution scheme it is proposed to take away nearly one-fourth part of the population of Kincardineshire and throw it into the borough of Aberdeen, and that the disparity between Kincardineshire and the borough of Aberdeen will thus be increased 50 per cent.; and whether, as the ostensible purpose of the scheme is to reduce the present disparity in the population of Parliamentary constituencies, he will undertake to alter the Resolution accordingly.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not deny that this Bill does not produce equal electoral areas; it does not produce them because it was not destined to produce them.

MR. CROMBIE asked whether this was not a case not only of leaving inequalities which existed, but of magnifying them.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not agree with that inference, nor do I think we can argue the question across the floor of the House; but if the hon. Gentleman asks me for an assurance that cases like this will be considered, my reply is that they will be considered.

South Down and Redistribution.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the the fact that, under the Redistribution proposals, South Down will have only one Member for a population of 58,000, whilst three British counties, Buteshire, Rutlandshire, and Sutherlandshire, will have three Members for a similar population; and whether, in view of the fact that the Redistribution proposals are introduced with the object of removing electoral disparities, he proposes to so amend them as to give to South Down a representation proportionate to that proposed to be given to Buteshire, to Rutlandshire, or to Sutherlandshire.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think I can add anything to the Answer I have already given.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND asked whether, in view of the change in the programme of Government business, the right hon. Gentleman could give the House any further information as to the course of business and the duration of the session.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: My hopes about the session are unchanged. I hope it will be possible to bring it to a conclusion at the end of the second week in August. The removal out of the Parliamentary path of the Redistribution Resolution may, I hope, facilitate the passage of legislation which otherwise would have been greatly imperilled. More than that I have nothing to say.

Mr. DALZIEL: When will the right hon. Gentleman be able to make a general statement as to the course of business?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I had better follow precedent and defer that until the time comes for suspending the 12 o'clock rule, when I shall make the usual statement about public business.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is it quite settled we are not to have three extra days for Supply?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not see any interstices in the period now remaining to us.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that out of 146 Votes to be submitted to the House only sixteen have as yet been passed; and under these circumstances is the Government going for the first time since the new rules were passed to reduce the time allotted to Supply?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that the passage of a Vote affords the smallest indication in modern practice of the time devoted to the discussion of Supply. I think we have devoted quite an enormous amount of time to the discussion of Supply this year.

NAVAL WORKS [CONSOLIDATED FUND].

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of making further provision for the construction of works in the United Kingdom and elsewhere for the purposes of the Royal Navy, and of authorising the payment, out of the Consolidated Fund, of such sums as may be necessary for those purposes (King's Recommendation signified)."—(*Mr. Pretyman.*)

Mr. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) thought that, as this was the preliminary stage to the introduction of another Naval Works Bill, the House ought to have some statement on the subject from the Secretary to the Admiralty.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Under the Standing Orders no statement could be made at this stage.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): In what position will it be on the Orders to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J.

BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he did not think the Bill was a very controversial measure, but he should be glad to come to some arrangment with the other side as to the stage most convenient for a discussion of its policy.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) asked if it were not the case that the Bill could not possibly be circulated before Friday. Under those circumstances was it intended to take the Second Reading that day.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR suggested it would be quite as well to take the debate on the Committee stage.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 222; Noes, 143. (Division List No. 292.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn.SirH.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury,Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Benn, John Williams
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Black, Alexander William
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles,Lt-Col.H.F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T.Gibson (King'sLynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Campbell,Rt. Hn.JA.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington,Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hn. Sir WilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,RtHn AilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt.Hn SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Rt HnSirR.B.(Inv'rn'ss
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Green WalfordD.(Wednesbury
Greene,HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath,Arthur Howard(Hanley
HeathSirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard'John(Kent Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd. Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt.Hn. Sir JohnH.
Kenyon, Hn.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.NR
Lee, ArthurH(Hants.Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Liddell, Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long, ColCharlesW. (Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S)
Londsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col.Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop. James (Stirlingshire)
Marks, Harry Hananel
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H(Dumfriessh.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, HerbertPike (Darlingt'n
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert

Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hn. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col Edw. J.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, HC(North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, RtHnJParker(Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W.F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Ed. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M‘Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N.E(YorkNR, Whitby
Buxton, Sydney Chas.(Poplar)
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellice, CaptEC(StAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Evans, SirFrancisH(Maidstone)
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alex (Lanark, N.E)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hope, JohnDeans (Fife, West)
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan, W.
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morley, Rt. Hn. John(Montrose)
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Peate, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Richards, Thomas
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spencer, Rt. HnC. R(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Phillips
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Wilson, FredW. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Lough and Mr. Dalziel.

CHURCHES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said that in the unavoidable absence of his hon. friend the Member for Halifax he desired in a very few words to move the instruction which stood on the Paper. He thought, if ever there was a case in which an instruction of this kind ought to be moved, it was in regard to this Bill. It dealt with two separate and distinct questions, and the point raised by the instruction was whether or not the Government had been justified in dealing with these two separate propositions at the present time and under the present circumstances. The first object of the Bill was to deal with a state of affairs that prevailed throughout Scotland and to which no Government could turn a deaf ear, and he thought there was a feeling of gratitude throughout the whole of Scotland that the Government had dealt with that unfortunate state of affairs with the least possible delay. The Bill was solely due to the decision of the House of Lords in the dispute between the Free Church and the United Free Church, and that part of the case for the Bill was, he thought, unanswerable. It was backed up by the unanimous opinion of the whole of Scotland, and the Government in the action they had taken were, he ventured to say, supported almost unanimously by both political Parties for Scotland.

The instruction dealt not so much with the merits of the Established Church as with the policy of introducing it at the present time, and he ventured to say that without this crisis with regard to the Free Church and the United Free Church the Government would never have brought the fifth Clause forward. There was no mandate for it and it had no driving force of public opinion behind it. If there had been any urgent demand for it, the Government would have found time necessary to carry a Bill, and, if they were convinced of the urgency for it, he had no doubt they would be able to find the necessary time next session to pass it. He would especially press the point that this instruction did not raise the merits of the fifth Clause. There might be many hon. Members on both sides of the House opposed to Establishment in Scotland who would hesitate some time before they would deny full freedom with regard to the administration of that Church. That point was not raised at the present time. The only point raised was whether the Government was wise or not, in dealing with a serious state of affairs in Scotland affecting two particular Churches, to take advantage of the crisis to introduce an altogether outside proposal. He hoped, therefore, the Government at this late hour would seriously consider whether they ought not to give the Committee the power he asked. He believed their action in doing so would be received with satisfaction by the great body of public opinion in Scotland and would tend to secure the passage of the Bill.

Mr. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) seconded.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an instruction to the Committee that they have power to divide the Bill into two parts, separating the provision relating to the Established Church of Scotland from those relating to the Free and the United Free Church."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

*The LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) said he could not, as the House was perfectly aware, agree to the Motion, and he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press it. He had lately stated the views he held on the matter. In dealing with this question they must deal with it as a whole, and to his mind Clause 5 was an essential part of the Bill for the settlement of the question. He would remind the hon. Member who had moved that the Leader of the Opposition, speaking of this very instruction, which was in the name of the hon. Member for Halifax, said, on the Second Reading of the Bill, that it was a matter which could be dealt with in Committee. He thought that was quite true.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs). Not this instruction.

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said the hon. Member for Halifax had an instruction to divide the Bill into two Bills, and the Leader of the Opposition said that, whether the form in which he had framed the instruction was right or wrong, the hon. Member was perfectly right in moving, because the two things were totally distinct. That, however, was not the point. The conclusion of the matter, according to the right hon. Gentleman's opinion, was that it could be dealt with in Committee.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That is the second barrel of the gun.

*MR. SCOTT-DICKSON said that undoubtedly, if the hon. Gentleman's point were a sound one, it could be dealt with in Committee by moving that Clause 5 should be omitted.

MR. DALZIEL said the instruction raised a question purely of policy, but, when they came to the fifth Clause, the division would be taken on that clause. The instruction simply dealt with the action of the Government and the policy of putting two propositions into one Bill.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said he thought every Member—he was quite sure he might say every Scotch Member—wanted to get to the business of the Bill. The instruction was one which he could not accept, and he accordingly trusted that, without spending time on what he might be permitted to term technicalities, they would get to the Bill on its merits and see whether they could not secure such a measure as he had already said more than once, both on the introduction of the Bill and on its Second Reading, was one which concerned all the Presbyterian Churches, and had not only as regarded the first but also as regarded the fifth Clause an important effect as to the prospect of the future union of all the Presbyterian Churches. He was satisfied there was a large body of public opinion in Scotland in favour of Clause 5 as well as of the rest of the Bill; and on these grounds, therefore, he submitted that the instruction was not one which the House should assent to and that they should get to the Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the right hon. Gentleman on a previous occasion urged, and he had now repeated the opinion, that the Bill should be dealt with as a whole. It was precisely because it was not a whole that the instruction was moved. There was no real substantial connection between Clause 5 and the rest of the Bill. He did not propose at that particular stage to discuss the merits of Clause 5, but he did not think it could be denied that it was a totally foreign element introduced into a matter which ought to be kept single, which ought to be treated as urgent, and which, he believed, was now practically in course of being settled to the satisfaction of most of those concerned, thanks to the concessions that the Government had made. But this fifth Clause was a foreign body altogether, and he, therefore, thought it was not unreasonable that his hon. friend should move the instruction, which he should support. The right hon. Gentleman had quoted some words that he had used. He merely expressed the opinion that this particular way of dealing with the matter might not be the usual form. He had in his recollection several occasions when the Chair had decided that an instruction was not in order for some reason or other, and that was the sense in which he said that it might not be in the proper form. He was in entire agreement with the idea of the instruction, and he thought his hon. friend was certainly entitled to bring the question forward as he had done.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said it was with some trepidation that he intervened in a Scotch matter, and he only did so because it established a serious precedent for England and Wales. If this clause were to be inserted in a Scotch Bill dealing with the Scotch Establishment, there was no reason why a similar one should not be inserted in an English Bill dealing with the English Establishment. They knew perfectly well that a claim had been put forward by a section of the clergy from which they had much to fear, certainly from the Protestant point of view, and that was the reason why the Protestant section of the Church itself had already taken steps to protest against this particular clause. He thought they had been wise, because it really established a serious precedent. For the first time it gave absolute powers of self-government; it created not merely an autonomy but an independent authority. Here was a Church with national endowments, and the control of those endowments was to be absolutely given to that Church without reference to Parliament. It was undoubtedly a precedent of a very serious character. He was not going to discuss the merits of the clause; he only referred to it by way of establishing his proposition. Power was given to the General Assembly, on the voice of the majority of the Presbyteries, to alter the formularies of the Church, and that meant practically altering the doctrines of the Church.

He was afraid the right hon. Gentleman had taken the same view of the Church formularies as he did of politics—that it really did not matter, that the particular formula of subscription was no indication of one's private opinion. When one said "retaliation" and "protection," it did not matter; it amounted to the samer thing. Surely when one signed a formula saying he believed in a certain Confession of Faith, it meant, amongst honourable men, that one really did believe in that Confession of Faith; and if they altered that formula in any way it meant that people who did not believe in that Confession of Faith need not necessarily be excluded from the Church. He was not complaining of that. He was in favour of giving the greatest breadth in Churches. He thought it was the only possible way in which they could develop an intelligent religion in any country; but if the Established Church wanted this freedom it ought to pay the price like any other Church. This power was given to the Scotch Church under conditions which were not given to the United Free Church of Scotland. Freedom was given to the United Free Church, but it had to pay a heavy price. Why should they make an exception in the case of the National Church, which was endeavouring to secure freedom without paying a price for it? It might not be a serious matter in Scotland where they were all more or less Presbyterians, but in England it was a very serious matter indeed.

There was no doubt a very powerful section of the Church whose motives were creating a good deal of uneasiness and anxiety amongst the Protestant community of this country. Supposing they had the same clause inserted in an English Bill, what would it mean? For the General Assembly they would substitute Convocation, and they would say that Convocation, with the consent of the majority of the rural diocesan conferences, could alter the formularies of the Church of England, and anyone who knew the condition of things in the Church of England knew what a serious thing that would be. It would mean that Convocation might convert, by a mere vote of the diocesan conferences, the Church into a Catholic Church. He did not think the House of Commons ought to create a precedent for that, and that it ought not to allow the alteration of the formularies of subscription without reference to Parliament itself. Parliament was likely to be Protestant for some time to come, but he could quite see where this had come from. It had come from Canterbury. He was perfectly certain of it. It was a suggestion from Canterbury with a view to eventualities. Probably it could not be done in the course of the present Parliament, though no one knew what might not be done, for the Government was capable of anything; but at any rate it might be done in some future Parliament. He had heard of a claim put forward by very powerful supporters of the Government. It was, for instance, exactly what the hon. Member for Greenwich had been claiming for the Church of England, and he might in the future quote this as a precedent in support of his case. It was simply a great flanking movement. It was represented as a march on Edinburgh, but its real objective was Canterbury.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): May I ask, on a point of order, whether it is proper to discuss the merits of Clause 5, or whether we are not confined to the question of whether Clause 5 should not be converted into a separate Bill? Your ruling will have some effect upon the course of debate.

Mr. DALZIEL: May I further submit to you whether it would not be in order to refer to the merits of Clause 5, in so far as they are reasons for making the clause a separate Bill?

*Mr. SPEAKER: The instruction cannot very well be discussed without referring to Clause 5 and the general principle it contains, but obviously it would not be right to discuss the merits of it at length. I was thinking of rising towards the conclusion of the speech of the hon. Member for Carnarvon, but as he began by saying he did not intend to discuss the merits of the clause, I concluded he was not going to do so.

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said the Bill arose entirely out of a private dispute between the majority and minority of the original Free Church, and Parliament was dealing with a purely private question of property which had nothing whatever to do with the religious views of either one side or the other. Parliament was dealing with a matter in the same way as if an educational endowment had become inoperative and it had been appealed to, and the case was the same as if they were dealing with a private Bill upstairs. Parliament was simply dealing with a question of civil property as between two bodies of a Church. What on earth had their formularies or their views on religious questions to do with that? It was merely an accident that the property belonged to a Church. Clause 5 was therefore altogether *ultra vires*. It was said that the people of Scotland would be willing to give the Established Church freedom. That might be so, but it would not tend to the dignity of the Established Church to say that they found a Church in distress in regard to its funds, and took advantage of that to put into a Bill a clause giving them certain powers in order to carry out ecclesiastical views of their own. It would always rankle in the minds of the people of Scotland. The relative position of the Church of Scoltand was in no way affected by the mere circumstance of any division of property which would take place under the Bill. It would have been much better for the Government to agree to the proposed instruction. They had already got a Second Reading of the clause which was a substantial matter, and while Clause 5 was being considered as a separate Bill the remainder of the measure, for which so much urgency existed, could be dealt with in the other House. The acceptance of the instruction would greatly facilitate the passage of the Bill and save the irritation which every part of the community would otherwise feel at advantage being taken of another's distress to secure an ecclesiastical benefit to the Established Church.

Sir MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire) said that unless more rapid progress was made there would be little prospect of passing the Bill, and that, he thought, was sufficient justification for opposing the instruction. He believed that a great number of the United Presbyterians approved of the insertion of this clause, and that the same view was held by a large number of Members of that House. It was unanimously recommended by the Gentral Assembly after full discussion, and, therefore, it could hardly be said to have come from Canterbury or any other similar quarter. He hoped the Motion would not be pressed, and that the House would be unanimous in endeavouring to pass the Bill as soon as possible. With the exception of this debateable clause the Bill was framed to secure, not convenience, but justice and equity, and, that being so, he hoped that no time would be lost in passing the measure into law.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) pointed out that the only impediment to the rapid progress of the Bill lay in Clause 5. With that exception the measure had become practically uncontroversial—by which he did not mean that there were not points in regard to which the Bill could be improved, and upon which the Government would be pressed to make further concessions, but broadly speaking the Bill was not controversial as between the two sides of the House except in regard to Clause 5. The prospects of the Bill were seriously injured by the introduction of that clause, as it raised questions which ought to be considered altogether apart from the differences between the two branches of the old Free Church, and involved large issues in which England and Wales were directly interested. Those matters should be dealt with separately, in order that they might be considered on their merits. They could not be so considered under the present arrangement, and, therefore, he regretted the decision to which the Lord-Advocate had come.

MR. GUEST (Plymouth) said that, as an Englishman who did not pretend to be an expert on Scotch ecclesiastical matters, he failed to see how Clause 5 could be an integral part of the Bill, and he did not believe that the Government would drop the measure if they failed to carry that clause. It raised points on which many Members felt very strongly, and it would be an act of courtesy to allow the House to pronounce an opinion on the merits of the remainder of the Bill, leaving this clause to be discussed subsequently if the Government thought it necessary. It was probably not the intention of the Government, but this clause might accidentally develop into a precedent for dealing with troubles in the English Church. All Establishment involved uniformity, and uniformity must be subject to that House, and in so far as the control of formulas was handed over to a Church, so far that Church ceased to be established. That was the view which he in common with many others held, and he mentioned it to show how large were the questions raised by this clause, and to urge the Prime Minister to meet the genuine desire of Members on that side of the House, so that they might assist in the carrying out of that part of the Bill with which all agreed, without having to deal with the matters involved in Clause 5.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) thought the Prime Minister must see that the inclusion of Clause 5 was not going to facilitate the passage of the Bill. He would not attempt to lift the veil which hung over the origin of the clause, but if it were ever reached he hoped to move an Amendment raising all the issues referred to by the hon. Member for Carnarvon. The point which appealed to him in favour of the instruction was the fact that owing to its being included in this Bill it was impossible to get the unbiassed Scotch opinion on the clause. He did not wish to be offensive, but Scotch Free Church Members collectively were rather in the position of the proverbial donkey who saw a bunch of carrots in front of him which he was determined to get; their minds were thereby obscured and rendered incapable of giving an impartial judgment on this clause. English Members had a right to protest against anything that prevented the obtaining of the clear and unbiassed judgment of the Scotch intellect, which was so much valued, especially upon Church matters, and for that reason he should support the Amendment.

*MR. J. A. CAMPBELL (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) was surprised that hon. Members should say there was a want of connection between this clause and the rest of the Bill. Those who held that view must have forgotten how much the subject of creed subscription entered into the judgment of the House of Lords. The clause related to the relaxation, under certain limitations, of the formula of subscription for ministers of the Church of Scotland. The subject of creed subscription was not left by the decision of the House of Lords as it had been before. There was no denying that expressions used, notably by the Lord Chancellor, gave a much more rigid interpretation to creed subscription than was generally understood and practised. All along they had had to contend against the over-scrupulousness of some persons who shrank from signing the Confession because they thought their signature bound them down to every expression in it. He could not say that he had met with many of these over-scrupulous persons among his own friends. He himself, with others, had signed the Westminster Confession of Faith without hesitation. He had signed it in a broad and liberal sense, and he found that others had done the same. But still there were people who were disposed to put a more rigid interpretation upon creed subscription, and their views in this matter seemed to receive some support from the decision of the House of Lords. So that now when Parliament was dealing with a Bill the object of which was to remedy a very unhappy state of things in Scotland which had resulted from that decision, it seemed not unfitting to remove at the same time a grievance which the Church of Scotland complained of, and which had been aggravated by opinions expressed in reaching that decision. Upon these grounds he saw a natural connection between this clause and the rest of the Bill, and he hoped the Government would stand firm and uphold the Bill as a whole.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 103; Noes, 203. (Division List No. 293.)

AYES.

Allen, Charles P.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Chas. (Poplar)
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, M. Vaughan(Cardigan)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonsh.)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitton, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.
Moulton, John Fletcher
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway),N
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J.A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Richards, Thomas
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spencer, Rt. Hn.CR(Northants
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Dalziel and Mr. Eugene Wason.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C.B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. HnGeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh
Brymer, William Ernest
Buxton, N.E(YorkNRWhitby
Campbell, Rt. HnJ.A(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, RtHnJA (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H.A.E.
Coddington, Sir William
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir J. C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred D.
Doughty, Sir George

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hn. A. de Tatton
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt.EC(SAndrw'sBghs
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Rt. Hn. Ailwyn Ed.
Fergusson, RtHn.Sir J(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt.Hn. George H.
Finlay, Rt Hn SirRB(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Gardner, Ernest
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, W. Raymond(Cambs)
Grenfell, William Henry
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hn. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nde'ry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur HowardHanley
Heath, SirJas. (Staffords.N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt.Hn. Sir John H
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T (Denbigh
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn. H.L.W (Mile End
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Liddell, Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long, Col. Chas. W.(Evesham)
Long, RtHnWalter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop,James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,Rt HnSirHE(Wigt'n)
Maxwell,W J H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, RtHn. Sir FrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hn. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert W.
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. ChasThomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hn. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H(Renfrew
Smith, RtHnJParker(Lanarks
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hn. Chas. Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Welby, Lt.-ColA.C.E(Taunton)
Wharton, Rt.Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (AshtonundLyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) moved an Amendment having the object of leaving the whole question of the allocation of property to the Commissioners without any reservation or special instructions. If this Amendment were accepted it would, he said, very much facilitate the passing of the Bill. Why should they introduce reservations and restrictions on the discretion of the Commissioners? Why should this House endeavour to instruct them in regard to what would be, perhaps, the most difficult part of the task they had to undertake? The House knew from the general terms of the Bill that it would be the duty of the Commissioners to make an equitable division of property between the Free Church and the United Free Church, and the general line on which they were to make that equitable division was indicated in the second paragraph of the preamble as follows—

> "And whereas a Commission appointed to inquire into the matter have reported that the Free Church are unable adequately to carry out all trusts of the property, and that it is desirable to provide for the allocation thereof, provision being made for the equipment of the Free Church—"

He thought the House might fairly trust the Commissioners to make a fair and equitable division of the property. All Scotch Members would allow that the Government had selected a fair body of men to discharge the duties of Executive Commissioners under the Act. They had added to the Elgin Commissioners two gentlemen who were well known to many Members of the House—gentlemen of sound judgment, well acquainted with Scotch affairs, and admittedly impartial. He thought everyone must acknowledge the caution, wisdom, and impartiality with which Lord Elgin and his colleagues discharged the difficult task which was set to them. This Bill was based on the Report which that Commission presented to the House, and it was owing to that Report that things had gone on in Scotland without a much greater outburst of public feeling than there had been. On these general grounds he strongly urged the Government to consider whether it would not be better to leave the whole matter of the division and allocation of property to the discretion of the Commissioners.

He urged this course also on the ground that Scotch Members in the House of Commons were in a small minority, and all of them could not pretend to have complete and detailed knowledge of this question. The vast body of English Members could make no claim to a knowledge of the question. In Sub-sections 2 and 3 they were proposing to give instructions to the Elgin Commissioners, who were already possessed of considerable light, and in the course of their inquiries they would have full light on the subject. If the House indicated to them the general lines on which they were to go, they might safely trust that the Commissioners would not go beyond those lines, and that they would make an equitable settlement on those lines. Sub-sections 2 and 3 had assumed various forms since the Bill was drafted. He did not blame the Lord-Advocate for that. It showed his wisdom in endeavouring to accommodate himself to the views of those who were most acquainted with the subject, but he did say that it also showed the great difficulty there was in laying down specific instructions on this most intricate part of the work which the Commission would have to do. The Commissioners would have full knowledge of the various proposals which had been made by the Government and the suggestions made by other Members, and it was certainly to be expected that in their allocation of the property they would endeavour to meet what they had reason to believe was the general sense and opinion of the House of Commons and the Government upon this intricate question. He believed that opinion in Scotland was generally in favour of the Commissioners being entrusted with the allocation of the property, having regard to the views contained in the Report of the Elgin Commission. He thought a great deal of grievance would be avoided if Sub-sections 2 and 3 were left out, and if they left the whole matter to the discretion of the Commissioners. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, to leave out Sub-section (2)."—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said there was no doubt much that was tempting in the suggestion of the hon. Member, but it practically transferred any responsibility which this House might take upon itself to the rather heavily-burdened shoulders of the five gentlemen whom the Government had appointed to carry out the Act. He would further remind the hon. Member that, tempting as the suggestion was, he did not think this House ought to thrust so heavy a reponsibility upon the Commissioners. No doubt the Commissioners would consider it a very sore burden to be borne, but he was influenced by other considerations than merely their convenience, for he did not think this House ought to set an example in this Bill of dealing with vast sums of money and property by handing them over to the absolutely uncontrolled action of these Commissioners without either laying down conditions beforehand, which must be fulfilled, or asking to see afterwards what had been the action taken for the purpose of approval. The last course everybody would feel to be impossible, for it would indefinitely postpone the settlement of the question, of which a rapid settlement was the very essence, and he thought they were driven to the other alternative, and that was to lay down certain principles, not too narrow, or too detailed, but principles which might enable the Commissioners to understand what was the mind of Parliament on the subject. He noticed that the hon. Gentleman himself in the course of his speech seemed conscious that the mind of Parliament ought to be considered by the Commissioners. His suggestion as to the method by which this was to be attained was that the Commissioners should read the debates and consider the speeches and suggestions made by the members of the Government and also by independent Members of the House, and so to form a sort of general idea of the trend of opinion within this House and within the walls of the House of Lords. He did not deny that anybody accustomed to read between the lines of Parliamentary debates could in that way very often derive a fairly sound conclusion of what the House intended without consulting the actual propositions which had been formed in the division lobby and which were recorded on the Statute-book, but he did not think it would be right to require any body of men whom they appointed to carry out this definite function to collect their evidence by the painful process of excogitation and criticism of the rather heavy pages of *Hansard*. He thought it would be simpler to lay down the lines to be followed—not in elaborate rules—as they were laid down in this Bill. He did not think that course could do otherwise than give satisfaction to the United Free Church. He thought that the legal Free Church would feel extremely bitterly if there were no propositions laid down which would in their opinion safeguard their interests as well as the interests of the other party to what he might call the suit. This consideration he would press with the more confidence, because he did not think the legal Free Church had in the House a single person, who felt that their interests were specially in his charge. He hoped they were all animated by a sense of justice and by a desire to see fair play, but it would not be denied that the great bulk of the House, to whichever Party they belonged, were in no sense representatives of the legal Free Church, and it, therefore, behoved them to do their best to frame the Bill in such a manner as would not give that Church any undue cause of complaint. If Parliament were to give money in bulk to the Commissioners, and leave the whole responsibility on their shoulders, he thought that would be unfair to the Commissioners and would arouse great suspicion and great misgiving in one party to the suit. He would, therefore, suggest that the hon. Member should not further press the suggestion he had made.

MR. WALLACE (Perth) said he should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the body who had already heard the evidence on the question of the allocation of the property, and who would have further opportunities of examining the facts, were not better qualified to determine the principles on which the allocation should be made than the House of Commons, the great bulk of whose Members were absolutely ignorant of the entire matter. It was on that ground they urged the Prime Minister to accept the Amendment. The only fear he had was that they might draw the line so strictly in regard to the principles that were to guide the Commissioners that they would find themselves compelled to do what they might think an injustice owing to the strictness of the lines laid down by the House. He would urge the Government to consider whether something could not be done in order to give a wider latitude to the Commissioners.

*MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said he wished to support what had fallen from his hon. friend. He had voted with the Government in the division on the last Amendment, and in this case he also wanted as much freedom as possible. He thought it would be most desirable that the Commissioners should be able to take into consideration all local circumstances, especially in the Highlands. He could suppose a case in which the majority of the congregation were on one side, while the greater part of the church work was being done by the minority. He believed that if the Lord-Advocate allowed the Commissioners as much freedom as possible with as large powers as possible, this would do much to secure peace and harmony on all sides.

MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) said he desired, if he might presume to do so, to ask his hon friend the Member for East Perthshire to withdraw the Amendment. His general view was that if the clause in the Bill had stood as it was originally framed, he should certainly have preferred that the Commission should be left a free hand. But he thought that the Government, on this matter—and he desired at once to make the acknowledgement — had behaved with considerateness since the Bill was printed. The negotiations prior to that date might have put the Bill into a different form, but looking to the body of the Amendment under which the Commissioners were to be appointed the Lord-Advocate seemed to believe that their position was to be absolutely trusted, and that they would have a statutory standard of conduct to guide them in dealing with a property so large. He did not conceal from the House that the whole proposal of the Bill was, from a Parliamentary point of view, a somewhat strong order. The appointment of an Executive Commission he had recognised from the first to be a very strong order only defensible on the ground that the complexities of the case were such that Parliamentary time would be consumed in what really were matters for a Commission. Now that they had the Elgin Commission; now that they had a desire on both sides of the House; and now that they had concessions made by the Government with regard to the line of action in relation to that Commission he would ask his hon. friend to withdraw the Amendment, on the ground that it would upset the entire body of negotiations which had, so far, made satisfactory lines for the conduct of the Commission. If he put himself in the place of one of the Commissioners he would ask himself whether, in view of the delicate situations which might arise, he would not feel more fortified in making awards under the Bill after Parliament had laid down the various lines for the Executive Commission than if there were no such statutory powers. While largely sharing the feeling of those who supported it, he appealed to his hon. friend to consent to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. BUCHANAN said he thought that he had pointed out a more excellent way; but if the Government and some of his friends on his side of the House would not support him the responsibility would be theirs. Recognising that he should be in a minority he asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton) said that the Amendment he wished to move was "In Clause 1, page 1, line 25, after the words 'Commission,' to insert the words 'in making their allocation of property under this Act.'" If the Committee would kindly direct their attention to lines 5, 6, and 7 of page 2 of the Bill they would see the following words:—viz., that the Commission had power—

> "To make special arrangements where several Church buildings are situated in the same neighbourhood, and in any other cases which appear to them to require exceptional treatment."

In the course of the negotiations, to which the hon. and learned Member for the Border Burghs had referred, it was suggested that these words, as the Bill originally stood, would apply only to the case of allocation to the Free Church, and not to cases of allocation to the United Free Church. He could not agree to that view; but the words he now proposed to insert, "in making their allocation of property under this Act," being general words were intended to, and, he believed, would successfully prevent that reading of the concluding part of Sub-section 2 to which he had referred. It was on that ground that he begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, after the word 'Commission,' to insert the words 'in making their allocation of property under this Act.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) asked whether the Lord-Advocate was satisfied that the word "allocation" comprised both churches.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said that that was undoubtedly his view. The point had been very carefully considered.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire) said that, in view of the Amendment put down by the Lord-Advocate immediately after his, he would not move the Amendment standing in his name.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said that the next Amendment standing in his name dealt with the negotiations which had been referred to by the hon. and learned Member for the Border Burghs. The effect of it was that instead of leaving the ascertainment of the members and adherents as they existed when the Elgin Commission came to make their inquiry, to one-third, the Amendment deleted that and went back to 1900, and required that one-third of the survivors of those who were members and adherents in 1900 should be taken instead of the original proposal in the Bill. Of course there were considerations on both sides as to whether that was the proper view to take. He quite understood that that was suggested by the hon. Member for Banffshire as what commended itself to both sides. On the whole the Government had come to the conclusion that the proposal he now made would meet the case.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 26, to leave out from the word 'that,' to the word 'with,' in page 2, line 4, and insert the words 'out of those who in the opinion of the Commission were members or adherents of the congregation on the thirtieth day of October, nineteen hundred, and are at the commencement of this Act both resident in the district, and members or adherents of the Free Church or United Free Church congregation, at least one-third are members or adherents of the Free Church congregation.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. THOMAS SHAW said that the Amendment of the Lord-Advocate represented, in his opinion, a large improvement or amendment of the Bill in two particulars. In the first place it went back to the firm ground of the year 1900; and in doing so it would enable the Commissioners at once to extinguish, if necessary, all those scandalous cases of the seizure of churches not only since 1900 but since the decision of the House of Lords. That was a vast improvement. The other improvement did not appear so satisfactory on comparing the Amendment with the Bill as it originally stood. But they could not forget that the earliest Amendment proposed was for one-fourth, which was felt to be totally inadequate to meet the situation. One-third was a considerable improvement, and he understood it would include upwards of a score of cases of great hardship which would not otherwise have been included. He might say that he was not at all convinced that one-third was adequate to the situation. He thought, however, that it was an instalment of justice much larger than had hitherto been offered.

Question put, and negatived. Words inserted.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) said the object of the Amendment he now moved was to give the Commissioners power to grant money compensation, and to raise money by bond not only on the general property, but also on the congregational property, if such an arrangement should be found convenient. Where churches were going over to the minority the Commissioners had a discretion under certain provisions of the Act. There was one kind of special arrangement which it seemed to him might be convenient, and which would prevent the feeling that otherwise might arise—that was to allow the Commissioners to arrange that a sum of money should be paid to the poorer congregations so that they might be enabled to build up a new and separate church. He did not feel sure whether under the general wording of the section the Commissioners had the power to make an arrangement of that kind. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 5, after the word 'however,' to insert the words 'to give money compensation in any such case or.' "—(*Mr. Parker Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said that unless they specified the fund from which the Commissioners were to draw money they would get into difficulties. He thought the only plan would be for his hon. friend not to press the Amendment.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW said the allocations in respect of which the hon. Member proposed to give money payments were allocations of congregational property. From the point of view of the United Free Church the position was an extremely hard one. Although they had two-thirds of the membership of congregation that two-thirds was to go out in its entirety, and the one-third was to retain the whole of the property, and no compensation was to be given to the two-thirds. From the pecuniary point of view he thought that was an injustice to which strong objection could be taken either from one side or the other. Where were they to obtain these funds from. The funds for compensation could only be contained in the congregational property, which was in the possession of the minority of one-third. What would happen would be that they would introduce a state of matters in which they would be launching into a separate existence one-third of the membership of a certain congregation with this burden of debt round its neck. There must be suffering on one side or the other, but at all events in starting separate congregations let them start them unshackled and untrammelled by debt.

Mr. WALLACE suggested that in the Bill as it stood there was power to give money compensation, the Commissioners having authority to deal with exceptional cases.

Colonel DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) said that unless certain words were struck out of the second Sub-section of Clause 2 such a thing could not be done.

Mr. PARKER SMITH said he thought the hon. Member for the Border Burghs had rather misconceived the effect of the Amendment. He was content with having raised the point; and knowing that the matter would lie in the hands of the Commissioners he would not press the Amendment.

Sir ROBERT REID suggested that between the Committee and the Report stages the Lord-Advocate should give some little thought to this matter.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. BLACK said the Amendment he now proposed was to provide that all congregational property not allocated to the Free Church should be allocated to the United Free Church.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 7, after the word 'treatment,' to insert the words 'all congregational property not allocated to the Free Church shall be allocated to the United Free Church."—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said according to his reading of Clause 1, Sub-section 1, that was the effect because the Commissioners were directed to allocate between the Free and the United Free Churches the whole property. If they gave so much to the one they must give the rest to the other.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said that the Bill stated that "adequate provision" should be made for a number of persons. He feared that the word "adequate" might lie in the hands of the Commissioners. It might take the form of an endowment which was unfamiliar to the experience of the Church. He would be ready to modify the Amendment by directing that "liberal" provision should be made. That would allow the Commissioners to have a free hand in carrying out their intentions as to what amount of endowment should be given for these purposes. There was another point in the Amendment, which was that all sources of income of the Free Church should also be taken into consideration. If the subscriptions given for congregational purposes were to be taken into consideration there was no reason why, for example, the fees from students should not also be taken into consideration or the existing endowments of the churches in calculating how much money was to be made up beyond these sources for making adequate provision for the church. The Lord-Advocate was understood to have given an assurance that the educational trusts of the church would be retained entirely for educational purposes but under the provisions of the Bill as it stood it would be possible to put a mortgage on the college buildings to be used for the general purposes of the Free Church. That seemed to many of them an objectionable form of pooling the trusts. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 8, leave out Sub-section (3) and insert the words (3) 'The Commisson, with due regard to the carrying out of the purposes for which the funds and property were respectively given, shall make such provision as they shall consider in all the circumstances to be reasonable for supplementing congregational contributions and other income of the Free Church for—(*a*) the theological education of the students for the ministry of that Church; (*b*) the support of aged and infirm ministers and of widows and orphans of ministers of that Church; (*c*) the support of the ministers of Free Church congregations to which the congregational property has been allocated under this Act; (*d*) provision for itinerant preachers; and (*e*) the general administrative purposes of that Church.'"—(*Mr. Corbett.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. BLACK, in supporting the Amendment, ventured to hope that the Lord-Advocate would meet them in this case as he had in others. Under the clause as it stood ministers of the legal Free Church were to be endowed out of the accumulations of the old Free Church without apparently continuing to contribute the insurance premium which by Act of Parliament they were called upon to contribute. It should be made plain that if the ministers of the legal Free Church were to participate in the widows' and orphans' fund they should continue to contribute the £7,000 which had hitherto been contributed by the Free Church. In considering, moreover, how much the United Free Church funds should be drawn upon, the Commissioners should first of all take into consideration all the sources of income open to the Old Free Church—the Sustentation Fund, legacies expected in the future, and the endowments which some of the congregations possessed. When all these sources of income were known, only then should the funds of the United Free Church be drawn upon by way of supplement.

MR. BRYCE agreed with the object of the Amendment. Common equity suggested that the other sources of income possessed by the legal Free Church should be regarded. If a congregation's contributions were to be included there was no reason why the other sources of income should not be included also. The words of the Amendment were far safer and more elastic than the words in the Bill. What they wanted was that the Commissioners should have great latitude in this matter, and he thought the word "reasonable" in the Amendment was a sufficient direction to them. It was hardly possible to consider this Amendment without referring to the Amendment of the Lord-Advocate in the schedule which would have to be considered later. That

Amendment was unobjectionable from the point of view which the Government had taken all through and which was perhaps the only principle on which they could proceed; namely, that a provision was to be made in the future for the Free Church out of what might be called the Parliamentary funds, the rest of which would belong to the United Free Church, and that so much of the property of the undivided Church as was appropriated to a particular object or trust should supply the amount necessary for enabling the legal Free Church to discharge the part of that ecclesiastical work it had to do. It was not improper in equity that the college property and funds which belonged to the old Free Church were now to be charged in the hands of the United Free Church for the benefit of the legal Free Church. That, he understood, was the Lord-Advocate's view, and to that they did not object. But the Lord Advocate went further, because he proposed to come for the second time on the college property for supplementing congregational funds. It had always been objected to that the same property should be taxed twice over, and he submitted that in this case it would be not only unfair in itself but it would be at variance with the principles which the Commission had laid down, and with the principles which the Lord-Advocate himself laid down in his speech on the Second Reading of the Bill, that college property after having been made to contribute to the legal Free Church students should be resorted to a second time for congregational and general purposes.

Sir ROBERT REID said he regarded the matter as so important that he would join in an appeal to the Lord-Advocate to accept the Amendment. The very essence of everything that had been done from the beginning to the end of this controversy was to attempt rigidly to carry out the trusts. It would be a strange thing if this Bill, which was intended to do that, should take the form of alienating trusts from their original purposes. He was not sure that there was any substantial difference between the intention of the clause and that of the Amendment. What was meant when they spoke of "adequate provision" was that they should make such provision as was necessary and fair after taking into consideration the other resources of the Church and the powers of the congregation to supply their own wants. But the way in which the clause was drafted left out of consideration the ability of the Church to help itself. He thought the words of the clause "adequate provision" were unfortunate and that they might lead to serious consequences. That obviously was not what was intended. What was intended was much better expressed by the Amendment, the phrasing of which, he thought, was a great improvement on the wording of the clause.

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON did not think it desirable that the Amendment should be accepted. He submitted that Clause 3, as it would stand if the two Amendments which he proposed to make were agreed to, really carried out substantially the points upon which they all seemed agreed. If they inserted the words of the Amendment, "with due regard to the carrying out of the purposes for which the funds and property were respectively given," they would imply that it was the duty of the Commissioners to ask what were the purposes for which the funds and property were respectively given, and it seemed to him that they would at once embark upon the task of discovering what the donors' intentions were. That, he thought, would be a most unfortunate result. The scheme of the clause as he proposed to amend it was not to leave that open. The scheme as he would make it would be that by a process of specification they should ensure that there would be no diversion of trusts, and the Committee would see that the schedules proposed by himself and his hon. friend respectively were practically agreed in that respect, with the exception of the last section of each. The next point in his hon. friend's Amendment was that the Commissioners "shall make such provision as they shall consider in all the circumstances to be reasonable," and he had stated that he would be prepared to make it "such liberal provision." He might remind the Committee that the recommendation of the Elgin

Commission on this point used the words—

> "That no such transfer should take place except upon equitable conditions, and especially that, the due performance of the trust being secured, liberal provision should be made for the equipment of the Free Church."

Unfortunately, there was no one in the House to represent the particular views of the smaller body, although no doubt they all intended to represent them as well as they could. It seemed to him that "adequate" was a much more restricted word than "liberal," although he agreed that in "adequate," as in "reasonable," they introduced the idea of opinion. But the Government considered that "adequate" was a better term and one more suited to an Act of Parliament than the word "liberal," which would be interpreted to mean that they should be given all they were entitled to and something in addition. He, therefore, submitted that Sub-section 3 really gave effect to what they all desired, viz., to provide suitably and sufficiently for the Free Church in this matter. In regard to the suggestion that in dealing with the education of the students of the Free Church fees should be taken into account, he believed that these would come to an infinitesimal figure, but again he should think that the Commissioners would to a certain extent take them into account. In the same way, in reference to the support of aged and infirm ministers, it would certainly occur to him that the Commissioners would take into account that those who were to be beneficiaries should certainly continue the contributions they had heretofore made.

SIR ROBERT REID pointed out that in two cases adequate provision was to be made, and only in one case were the Commissioners directed to take into consideration the supplementary contributions.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said that if it was thought that the Commissioners would not necessarily take that into account he would have no objection at a later stage to provide that that should be done. As to supplementing congregational contributions towards the support of ministers, he should say that congregational contributions would include all sources of income, even endowments, and if it was not sufficiently expressed he should be quite willing to make it clear. The remaining questions could be more properly discussed on the schedules. He had indicated the points upon which he would be prepared to make concessions. If those interested, and especially his learned friends, considered that any particular expression was required to give effect to them he would endeavour to meet them. He hoped his hon. friend would not press his Amendment to a division, but be content with the explanation he had given

MR. THOMAS SHAW said he thought the Lord-Advocate had met the Committee very fairly. The phrase as to adequately providing suggested most clearly a distinction between "supplementing" in certain cases and "adequately providing" in others. The result of the proposal in the Bill, unless it were materially modified, would be to have a system of permanent endowments set up which he was sure was not the intention of the Government itself or of any Party in the House. They were all agreed that to set up a system of permanent endowments for either of the Churches, or for any of their schemes, apart from the voluntary annual efforts of the Churches themselves, would be to perpetuate a system which might in course of years exhibit a result most disastrous to the development of the ecclesiastical life of Scotland. The question of supplementing the congregational contributions was quite well dealt with in Clauses 11 and 12, but there was some defect in the language, because in many of these Free Church congregations there were not inconsiderable endowments given for the support of the ministry in these churches, and in order to be complete, the phrase would require to be "for supplementing congregational contributions towards the support of the ministers of the church and all other resources or income for a like object." He hoped that on these points the right hon. Gentleman, with the spirit he had already shown, would go a step further in the direction he had indicated.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. BRYCE said he wished at this stage to ask the Lord-Advocate to consent to leave out the word "adequate" in line 8, and leave the provision as it stood in the Bill. The provision already made was quite sufficient to meet the case in hand. These poor churches of the legal Free Church for which provision was to be made had been mainly supported out of the Sustentation Fund assisted by liberal contributions from other churches. The circumstances had now entirely changed, and these churches would belong to the United Free Church, and they would lose the funds which they had hitherto had. Therefore they would in the future want all the funds they could get for themselves, and it would be impossible for them to continue their contributions to the other smaller churches. It might be that in future they would only be able to make very small contributions. The word "adequate" was very difficult to construe and he urged that it should be left out. The Bill as it stood would create a number of little weak churches with small endowments all over the North of Scotland, with their adherents and members falling off and nothing to keep up the church except the fact that there was an endowment. If the Lord-Advocate could not see his way to leave out the word "adequate" he hoped he would promise to consider the matter fully on Report.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 8, to leave out the word 'adequate.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'adequate' stand part of the clause."

Colonel DENNY thought that the dangers which had been predicted by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen were by no means unlikely to arise, and the very last thing they desired was inadequate provision for these churches. It seemed to him that as they were dealing with the Commissioners, three of whom had already laid down their own opinion that liberal provision should be made, they might safely leave the matter in their hands.

Sir ROBERT REID thought the Lord-Advocate had met them extremely fairly in regard to this matter. He was, however, of opinion that the word "adequate" was somewhat ambiguous, and he thought some other word might be used. He suggested the word "suitable."

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON promised to consider the point on the Report stage.

*Mr. AINSWORTH thought they would have to be careful to see that these funds could be used for immediate wants in cases of hardship.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I do not think that that is quite in order now.

Mr. BRYCE said he would accept the Lord-Advocate's assurance that he would reconsider the matter in all its aspects, and he asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. BLACK said the Amendment he desired to move was merely a drafting Amendment designed to restrict the provision made for students for the ministry of the Free Church.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 9, after the word 'students,' to insert the words 'for the ministry.'"—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said the Government were willing to accept the Amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 12, to leave out the words 'that Church,' and insert the words 'Free Church congregations to which congregational property has been allocated under this Act.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLACK said that had it not been for the Lord-Advocate's addition to this clause one would certainly not have supposed that provision for itinerant preachers was not included in "general purposes." This suggested the necessity for further definition. There was no very great difference of opinion between the Lord-Advocate and some of them as to what he meant. In order to see if the Lord-Advocate could suggest any more suitable definition he begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 13, to leave out the words 'for the general purposes," and insert the words 'for the due management and conduct of the business and financial affairs.'"—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said that what was now proposed was covered by his next Amendment. He did not think the Commissioners would have any difficulty in ascertaining what the general purposes of the church were. He did not know that the words which he proposed differed substantially from those of the hon. Member. They were sufficiently clear, and he did not think any difficulty would arise in the minds of the Commissioners as to their meaning.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said there was more substance in this than appeared at first sight. The expression "general purposes" would be much too vague. He suggested that the words "administrative purposes" should be used instead. If the words proposed by the Government were retained the Commissioners would be confronted with enormous claims for general purposes. He and his friends wanted to avoid that, and to give statutory instructions to the Commissioners which would enable them to say that this meant administrative purposes.

SIR ROBERT REID suggested the addition of the words "of administration and management" after the words "general purposes."

*MR. MACONOCHIE (Aberdeenshire, E.) thought the expression "general purposes" was too wide, and hoped the Lord-Advocate would see his way to adopt the sugestion of the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries Burghs.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said there was no difference between the two sides of the Committee as to intention, and he thought the Lord-Advocate might favourably consider the suggestion of his hon. and learned friend the Member for Dumfries Burghs.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON accepted the addition of the words suggested.

MR. BLACK asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 13, after the word 'purposes' to insert the words, 'of administration and management.'"—(*Sir Robert Reid.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 13, to leave out from the word 'Church' to the end of the Sub-section, and insert the words 'including expenses of administration and provision for itinerant preachers. The funds and property out of which provision may be made for each of the above-mentioned objects shall be those set out in the second column of the first schedule to this Act, opposite the description of the object in the first column of that schedule.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2:—

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON moved to leave out the words "including interim orders having temporary effect," in order to insert, after the word "fund," the words "and may also, before that allocation is made, make interim orders having temporary effect as respects the property in question as defined by this Act." He said the object of the Amendment was to meet cases in which there might require to be interim orders before an allocation was made as to the use of the property. The Amendment would enlarge the scope of the Commissioners in this respect.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, lines 16 and 17, to leave out the words 'including interim orders having temporary effect.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 20, after the word 'Fund' to insert the words 'and may also, before that allocation is made, make interim orders having temporary effect as respects the property in question as defined by this Act.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 21, at end, to insert the words 'and may be recorded in the usual manner in the Register of Sasines and other appropriate register, and such registration shall have the effect of vesting the property in the persons specified in the order.'"—(*Colonel Denny.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said he did not think the addition of these words was necessary, for the section with which they were now dealing provided that any order which the Commissioners might make should take effect as if enacted in this Act.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW said that this was a very important matter; and his first impression was that something was necessary to enable a congregation to take action in future years. What was wanted was that the order should not only be clear on the statute, but should be registered in such a convenient form that it would be easily recognised.

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said that what was wanted was that the title should be placed on the register, because it was only to that register that a would-be purchaser or mortgagor could go to discover who was the real owner of the property. This Amendment had been drawn by practical men who knew what should be in the title.

Mr. WALLACE said he quite agreed that the words should be considered on Report.

Colonel DENNY begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 22, at the beginning to insert the words 'Subject to the provisions of this Act.'"—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 25, after the word 'Church' to insert the words 'or in favour of third parties who may advance money for the purposes of such bond or charge.'"—(*Mr. Black.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLACK said that his next Amendment was designed to make provision for possible cases of congregational property and endowments becoming derelict. This was not an imaginary case in Scotland. He believed he was within the margin when he stated that there were at present about 160 endowments in Scotland that were, for all practical purposes, derelict, and which were kept up simply for the sake of the minister who enjoyed the endowments and for no real purpose affecting the necessities of the people of the district. It would be a genuine misfortune for Scotland if this was to be perpetuated. His proposal was not absolute; it only put power in the hands of the Commission to consider any particular case; and he had no doubt the Commission would consult all the parties before actually making an order.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 25, at the end to add the words 'and may provide for the disposal of any property in the event of any congregation interested in such property falling below a certain specified number of members and adherents.'"—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said that the proposal was not desirable for two reasons. The one was that the Commission should set to work as rapidly as possible, and get through their work as rapidly as possible. To give them the power suggested to keep a congregation in a state of suspended animation would not be good for anybody.

Mr. BLACK said that that was not his proposal.

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said he thought that was how it would work out. The Commission could not take into consideration what might happen five, ten, or fifteen years afterwards. The Commission had to take into consideration the facts as they found them at that time. The result of the proposal would be that their determination would not be final, and there would be a great state of uncertainty, which, he thought, would be most unsatisfactory.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW said he was not at all sure that the right hon. Gentleman correctly interpreted the Amendment, which did not contemplate the continuation of the Commission. There might be certain circumstances where a proviso of this kind might be necessary, where, for instance, the population had declined, and that state of matters might result in the complete disappearance of the endowments. He also pointed out that this proviso was not compulsory, and he hoped his right hon. and learned friend would accept the Amendment.

Sir ROBERT REID thought that the Amendment might be slightly altered to this effect that the ultimate disposal of the property should be dependent not upon a certain specified number of members and adherents, but upon the event of the trust failing or falling through. He could not help thinking that it would be rather an extraordinary thing if a ministry was to be kept up when there was no congregation, while there was a considerable want of money for a congregation in the same parish. To transfer the money, without the power now proposed, would require a new Act of Parliament for each particular case. He would rather see the Commission provide for the dedication of the money in any direction than see it wasted.

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON said he would remind his hon. and learned friend that the Elgin Commission in several clauses of their Report suggested that it would only be fair to provide for the future development of the Free Church. Now, if they provided for the reverse process they would be able to advance the very strong argument that if they made provision against things getting worse, they ought also to leave a way open for their getting better.

Mr. CALDWELL said that the object of the Amendment was to provide for the carrying on of the trust, and it was not a question of giving money to one Church or the other. It would be altogether contrary to the spirit of the Bill if that trust failed altogether.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said that it should be made clear in the clause that in the event of the trust failing the property should revert to the United Free Church.

Mr. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said that it seemed to him they wanted the Commission to settle once and for all between the United Free Church and the Free Church, and that being so he was prepared to give way to expediency in the matter, and in order to get peace and settlement he should be inclined to suggest that it was worth letting this matter go.

Mr. WALLACE said he ventured to join in that opinion, but he thought there was a great deal in the view of the Lord-Advocate that they might have to consider the case of a church which had grown in numbers as well as that of a church which had diminished in numbers.

Mr. BRYCE said he was afraid they might be leaving out what might hereafter cause trouble. He thought they were assuming too easily that they would not have some future legislation for extending the powers of the Commission.

Question put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed —

"In page 2, line 25, at the end to insert the words, 'Any congregational property allocated to either Church shall be subject to any bonds or burdens thereon, or in respect thereof, and the Commissioners may charge upon the particular congregational property concerned any money expended since 31st October, 1900, on improvements of property, or in paying off debt incurred in respect of property.'"—(*Colonel Denny.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. PARKER SMITH moved to insert at end of Clause 2, page 2, line 28, "as at the date of allocation." He said the Amendment raised a large question. By means of the Bill the Free Church was making a very great and far-reaching change in its constitution. Hitherto its constitution, so far as it concerned any of its property, had been limited by a model trust deed, and the result of that deed, as they all knew, was the recent action in the House of Lords and the whole of this question. Now the United Free Church was altering its constitution so as to free itself from all the bonds of the model trust deed and to enable it to hold property for such trusts as the majority of the General Assembly might from time to time determine. That was a most important and far-reaching change in the whole position of the Free Church. They were quite entitled to ask for it; but he wanted it to be clear that it would be a clear and final change, and that when they got the property it would be allocated to them according to the new conditions, so that no question could arise in the future and no suggestion could be made that any property held by the United Free Church would be subject to the limitation which the United Free Church was now seeking to get rid of. It was most important that that should be clear, and with a view to that he moved the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 28, at the end, to insert the words 'as at the date of allocation.'"—(*Mr. Parker Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. THOMAS SHAW said he could hardly conceive anything more upsetting to the concord of the Assembly than to press an Amendment of this kind. The suggestion was that they should stereotype the constitution, and he could not imagine anything more fruitful of litigation than the point as to what was the exact scope and dimensions of the constitution of the various Churches at the date of allocation. They wanted to leave the Churches to develop according to modern ideas, seeking the light as they found it, and that they should at all events have the powers of self-government. He hoped, therefore, that the hon. Member would not press the Amendment.

MR. PARKER SMITH said the constitution of the Free Church as at the date of allocation did contain that power.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said that was absolutely correct as regarded one of the Churches, but it was not correct with regard to the other. Were they going to allocate property to Churches and bind them never in the future to have the power of altering or modifying their own constitution. He should not be a party to that at all.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said he hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment.

MR. PARKER SMITH asked permission to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 3, after the word 'rights' to insert the words 'duties and liabilities' (*Mr. Corbett.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4:—

MR. PARKER SMITH said the Amendment he now moved was to cover the case of the Ferguson bequests and to make sure that the same position should obtain in the future as in the past. Both the United Free Church and the

Free Church should get a benefit under the Ferguson bequests, and no question should arise in the future in regard to such a trust as that. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed —

"In page 3, line 38, after the word "Church" to insert the words "or any congregation thereof.'—(*Mr. Parker Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

* MR. SCOTT DICKSON accepted the Amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

* MR. SCOTT DICKSON said the purpose of the next Amendment was to bring a certain class of legacies within the power of the Commissioners—legacies under testamentary writings, which the Commissioners were of opinion were made before the Union, the makers of which testamentary writings having survived until after the Union. It was, in the general opinion, a proper thing to do. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 14, at the end, to insert the words, "(3) Any legacies under testamentary writings made before the thirtieth day of October, 1900, by testators who died thereafter and before the commencement of this Act in dispute between the Free Church and the United Free Church, shall be allocated to or apportioned between the Churches in such manner as the Commission deem fair and equitable, having regard to what seems to them to have been the intention of the testator, and the capacity of the Churches respectively to carry out any special trusts annexed to the legacy; and all proceedings in any Court as regards any disputes between the two Churches in respect of such legacies shall be sisted or stayed."—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HALDANE said that the Amendment was a most wise and statesmanlike settlement of a most awkward question. He only rose to ask whether the words covered all the Lord-Advocate intended to cover. He noticed the words were confined to legacies in dispute between the United Free and the Free Church. Would the Amendment cover the case of a legacy likely to be in dispute but not in dispute at the present time? In England no question of dispute could arise until the legacy became payable. Had the matter been made clear? If it had not he would suggest that the words "or which might hereafter be in dispute" should be inserted so as to cover the whole ground.

* MR. SCOTT DICKSON thought the addition of those words was unnecessary. In Scotland there was no difficulty in raising the question of who would be entitled to a legacy when it was payable. He might here also say, in reply to the Amendment which was down on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Mid-Lanarkshire, that he had considered very carefully the proposal in that Amendment and had come to the conclusion tha he word "legacies" was wide enough, and that it was not necessary to add after legacies "or dispositions of property." He was quite ready, however, to consider before the Report stage the question of dispositions of property *mortis causa.*

MR. CALDWELL said the Amendment was only put down to make sure that the views of the right hon. Gentleman were carried out. He had put down those words because money could be left to the Church in so many ways, and only one had been covered by the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman. "Legacies under testamentary writings" did not cover the case of a person who had parted with money during his lifetime, with he proviso that after the death of the tenant for life it should go to the Church.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said they were all agreed as to what was meant by the clause, but the clause was very important. No less than a third of £1,000,000 was covered by this clause, and the word "legacies" seemed rather inadequate to the position, because there might be specific grants of property to which the word "legacy' could not apply. This clause had a bearing on the other clauses in the Bill to this effect, that here was a fund which ought to be taken into account when the question of provision was dealt with. That matter had been discussed, and he referred to it only to say that adequate provision was to be made, not as if there was nothing else coming to the Church, but that the resources of the Church were to be taken into account, including such resources as might be dealt with under this clause.

MR. CALDWELL moved to insert after "legacies" the words "or dispositions of property."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 1, after the word 'legacies' to insert the words 'or dispositions of property.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON thought the Amendment unnecessary, as the words of the Amendment were sufficiently wide.

MR. HALDANE suggested that the recognised legal term was dispositions of property *mortis causa.*

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said he would consider that.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CALDWELL moved to add at the end of the proposed Amendment—

"And with regard to any legacies or dispositions of property under testamentary or other writings made before the thirtieth day of October, nineteen hundred, by testators who may die after the commencement of this Act, the Commission shall make provision for allocating the same to either or to both of the said Churches as the Commissioners may think proper."

He said there was no doubt about such cases as those referred to in his proposed Amendment arising. He instanced the case of a man who left property to the Church contingently on the life of another person. The property would not vest in the Free Church while that person was alive, but, the first residuary legatee having died, the money might be vested after the Act came into operation. Another case would be that of a man who had made a will, and was not now in a condition to alter it. There was no provision in the Bill for dealing with the property in cases of that kind. Were the Commissioners to remain in office until every conceivable case had been dealt with? He suggested that the better plan would be for the Commissioners to make provision for clearing the whole matter off. Having made "adequate provision" for the legal Free Church some of the Commissioners might think that any such legacies should naturally revert to the other body, but there was nothing in the clause to bind them; the Commissioners were given full power to deal with money of that kind. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 9, at the end, to add the words 'and with regard to any legacies or dispositions of property under testamentary or other writings made before the thirtieth day of October, nineteen hundred, by testators who may die after the commencement of this Act, the Commission shall make provision for allocating the same to either or to both of the said Churches as the Commissioners may think proper.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added to the proposed Amendment."

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said the Amendment would seem to require the constitution of a standing Commission until all the testators who existed in 1900 had been killed off.

MR. CALDWELL said the words were specially put in to prevent the like of the case alluded to by the Lord-Advocate.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said he hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment. The word "legacies" was quite wide enough to cover the cases raised by the hon. Member.

MR. CALDWELL said that the Bill made no provision for money which might come to the Church from persons who died after the commencement of the Act, and in such a case the question would have to be decided by litigation. He would, however, ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5:—

MR. WALLACE moved the postponement of Clause 5 in order that the House might first proceed to the consideration of the schedule.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That consideration of the clause be postponed."—(*Mr. Wallace.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR agreed to this proposal.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 6:—

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 1, to leave out the "Schedule," and insert the words,

Schedules.

First Schedule.

Object.	Funds and Property.
1. Education of students of the Free Church.	1. College endowments and bursary Funds; college buildings.
2. Support of aged and infirm ministers of the Free Church.	2. Aged and Infirm Ministers Fund.
3. Support of widows and orphans of ministers of the Free Church.	3. Widows and Orphans Fund.
4. (a) Supplementing congregational contributions towards the support of ministers of Free Church congregations to which congregational property has been allocated under this Act. (b) General purposes of the Church, including expenses of administration and provision for itinerant preachers.	4. Sustentation Fund; Home Missions Fund; Highlands and Islands Fund; any moneys which the Commission regard as applicable for general Church purposes. So far as those Funds or moneys are not sufficient, any further amount required for this object shall be provided by such bond or charge as the Commission may direct to be imposed on any land or buildings in Scotland allocated to the United Free Church other than congregational property, training colleges for teachers, schools, and any land or buildings bequeathed for special purposes.

Second Schedule."

—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

MR. BLACK proposed an Amendment to the proposed Amendment.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said he could not accept the Amendment. Heading 4 (a) of the schedule corresponded exactly with the words which they had passed in Clause 1, Sub-section 3, of the Bill, and he thought they must adhere to the language they had already passed. The hon. Member's Amendment with regard to the funds available was hardly in accordance with the negotiations which had taken place, because all parties were agreed that in addition to the Sustentation Fund, Home Mission Fund, and the Highlands and Islands Fund, there were other funds which would fall properly under the short designation of funds applicable for Church purposes or free funds. There were a number of small legacies and trust funds which would fall under the designation of being applicable for general Church purposes. The schedule was entirely in accordance with the negotiations which had taken place that the three funds which were set out in both schedules should be liable to be supplemented by such other moneys as the Commissioners should hold to be free funds.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said he was far from being satisfied with the statement which the Lord-Advocate had just made. He objected altogether to the phrase "free funds." He should like to know from the Government what they meant by free funds. The proposal was to specify all the various funds which were to be impounded for this particular object in the earlier portions of the schedule. What was proposed under the two sub-heads (a) and (b) of the fourth head in the schedule was to provide for—

> "Supplementing congregational contributions towards the support of ministers of Free Church congregations to which congregational property has been allocated under this Act."

And for

> "General purposes of the Church, including expenses of administration and provision for itinerant preachers."

The Government proposal was that after the Sustentation Fund, the Home Mission Fund, and the Highlands and Islands Fund were exhausted, the Commissioners should have power to put their hand into the general pocket of the Church and lay a mortgage on the funds of the Church in so far as a fund specifically allocated should be found insufficient. That appeared to him to be a breach of trust. It had never been anticipated by anyone who contributed to these funds that a mortgage would be laid upon them in order to supplement congregational contributions towards the support of ministers of the Free Church in the Highlands or Islands. The moment they went beyond the three specific purposes set out as the Sustentation Fund, the Home Mission Fund, and the Highlands and Islands Fund, they got completely into the region of breach of trust, and, therefore, this schedule seemed to him a schedule for facilitating the diversion of moneys specifically provided for one object in order to give them to another. He hoped the House would not permit such a diversion of funds as was here proposed.

MR. BLACK said he could not help feeling that the Lord-Advocate had not quite grasped the original proposal he had put before the House, which was not only that the miscellaneous funds which might form the subject of some differences of opinion should be appropriated for the Sustentation Fund, but also that it might be possible for the Commissioners to put a mortgage on mission buildings in India.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: It is confined to Scotland.

MR. BLACK said that might be so, but with regard to the generality of the funds he was correct in saying that the proposal was not confined to the miscellaneous funds mentioned. Under this proposal it would be possible to bond the college buildings in Aberdeen, Edinburgh, or Glasgow for the purpose of providing sustentation for ministers in the Highlands and Islands. He hoped that the Lord-Advocate would make a further concession on this point.

MR. BRYCE hoped they would hear something further from the Lord-Advocate on this matter. He understood the right hon. Gentleman's previous reply to be confined to the earlier part of the schedule. He did not understand him to be endeavouring to justify the proposal that a charge should be put on the college buildings.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said he did not know that the Amendment went so far. It certainly was understood by those with whom he had had communication that there would be no objection to the bonding of the Assembly buildings on the Mound in Edinburgh by way of supplement to the other Church funds. The college property was an integral part of the Church property, and its possession had been made a question of decision in the House of Lords. The United Free Church had no right to this property, and the legal Free Church were now in possession of it; and this being the position of affairs he could not see how the conferring of this power on the Commissioners could be described as a breach of trust.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said that in regard to the General Assembly Hall which had been adjudged to belong to one of the Churches, it was said that it would be a strong order to grant a bond over that hall for the purposes of the other Church. There was no objection to a bond over the Mound property in Edinburgh, provided that the purpose to which the money was to be devoted was for analogous purposes in the Free Church. It would be perfectly equitable and proper that a bond or mortgage should be put over the General Assembly Hall for the purpose of erecting a new small hall for the Free Church, but it would be entirely out of the question that they should consent to a mortgage being placed on the general buildings of the Church in order to set up congregations in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. He might point out that these buildings had been erected, not only out of the general funds of the Free Church, but by special bequests to provide additional buildings, and for the adornment of the hall. The proposal made in the schedule was to divert these funds which donors had given for general administrative purposes to purposes entirely alien to general administration. He hoped that the Government would consider the point he had put.

***MR. SCOTT DICKSON** said that, in the light of the hon. and learned Member's criticisms, he would consider the subject with the view of arriving at a settlement on the Report stage.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Schedule agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

ALIENS BILL.

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment proposed [17th July] on Consideration of the Bill, as amended.

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out Clause 2."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said he had listened with great attention to the speeches made on the previous night with reference to Clause 2, and he had heard the Answers given by the right hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Bill, and who had conducted it with such marked ability, who had fully met the objections that had been taken to this part of the Bill. There was, however, one matter of great importance to those unfortunate people who might try to find a home in this country, and that was that the appeal should be heard as promptly as possible. He himself had given much attention to this matter in New York, and had often been present at the sittings of the Court at Ellis Island, where the Court was in constant session to deal with doubtful cases. It was of course impossible with the limited funds at the disposal of the Home Secretary and the larger number of ports in this country to have Courts in constant session, but at the same time he had no doubt that provision would be made for the assembling of a competent board as rapidly as possible to deal with these cases. The clause was framed in such a way as to ensure that the board should be composed of men accustomed to deal with matters of this character and who would be able to cross-examine the alien and ascertain if he were a desirable person to admit into this country. He therefore did not think that the word "business" should be altered in any way. It was not necessary to labour this point, because he was convinced that hon. Gentlemen opposite must be perfectly satisfied as to the fairness with which this Bill would be carried out. He had implicit confidence in the Home Office at all times, but especially when it was administered by his right hon. friend.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put;" but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

*MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said it was within the recollection of the House that during the debates on this Bill it was argued that the immigration board to be established should have the confidence of all those concerned. Yet members of the Opposition proposed to leave this important clause out altogether. The clause provided that the members of the board should consist of three persons appointed in accordance with rules laid down by the Home Secretary, out of a list approved by him, of fit and proper persons having magisterial or administrative experience. If it was absolutely necessary for shipowners, it was equally necessary for the immigrant that his case should be promptly settled. There was in existence a body called the port sanitary authority in many ports from which such a board could be formed, and one in which not only the shipowner but the captains of vessels, and the authorities generally, would have confidence. The port sanitary authority for the Tyne consisted of several magistrates, two or three shipowners, and others who were accustomed to deal with matters such as these and able to deal with them quickly. Yet Members opposite, without giving one thought to this question, asked the House, composed as it was largely of business men and accustomed to such matters, to leave the clause out. The clause also provided that notice should be given to masters and immigrants informing them of the right of appeal. Were hon. Members opposite aware that if this clause were left out there would be no one to whom these unfortunate immigrants, who might be our own countrymen coming back from America in order to take part in the prosperity of the cotton trade of Lancashire, could appeal? When he and other Members rose to point that out they were jeered at by the Opposition. The clause also laid it down that, notice having been given, the master and the immigrant were to be informed of the grounds on which leave to land was refused. That was an important matter which had not received sufficient discussion, and he was well within his rights in drawing attention to it. But one of the most important points in connection with the Bill was the board which was to be formed to deal with the immigrants as they came in. There was no better body from which such a board could be formed than that of our port sanitary authorities. He had received a request from the port sanitary authority of Newcastle on-Tyne asking him to point out to the Home Secretary that these bodies were in existence, and he trusted that when the right hon. Gentleman framed these rules he would remember their existence. If he did, and appointed the immigration boards from them, he would find he had appointed most efficient bodies.

MR. PURVIS (Peterborough) said that notwithstanding the somewhat surprising and unusual desire of hon. Members opposite to go to a division, he felt constrained for a short time to intervene in this debate. They had heard at great length day after day elaborate arguments from hon. Gentlemen opposite, and hitherto he had only been a listener, but as the Bill was of universal interest to the country, and as this clause was of such peculiar interest to those who had any knowledge of the administration of the laws of the country, he was quite sure the most impatient Member of the House would bear with him for a few moments. As a lawyer he could conscientiously say that he was convinced that it would be better for the immigrants themselves that they should have the right to appeal to a board rather than a Court of Appeal. They had heard a good deal of prosecution and persecution, and anybody who carefully considered this matter must come to the conclusion that to relegate these unfortunate people to the law's delays by sending them to a Court of Appeal would be not only to persecute, but to ruin in many cases the unfortunate appellant. Their great object should be to create a good businesslike board which should be able, owing to its composition, to deal with the cases which from time to time were brought before it. He had been much struck by the suggestion that the word "industrial" should be substituted for the word "business." Such a change would exclude entirely from the board men having knowledge of administration—such men as magistrates, solicitors, barristers, and others acquainted with the administration of the laws, and having a knowledge of the rules of evidence. Could anyone conceive anything more unfortunate than that the poor immigrant, about whom so much sympathy had been expressed, should be brought before a board which was absolutely destitute of the knowledge of the simplest rules of evidence. There must be a quorum, and the clerk must be able to choose from a panel which would do justice to the immigrant. Then it would be impossible to have such a large number in the smaller ports as in London, and that was another reason for greater variety being secured in the panel. Those qualities must be secured in order to ensure fair play to the unfortunate foreign immigrant. The only way to secure freedom and liberty was to have a board composed of different qualities. The board of appeal would degenerate into a board of persecution without the qualification provided by the second part of the clause.

Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put;" but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

Mr. FORDE RIDLEY (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said he could not understand the intention of the hon. Member who had moved the Amendment, nor the anxiety of hon. Gentlemen opposite to conclude the debate.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): There are eight more clauses to discuss.

Mr. FORDE RIDLEY said he would remind the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs that if he had remembered that in the earlier stages of the Bill they might now have had a good deal more time in which to discuss the remaining clauses. After all the arguments that had been used about the injustice, the hardship, and the cruelty going to be done to the poor immigrants, it was, he must say, the strangest of all anomalies that hon. Gentleman opposite, who had been palpably opposed all through to the Bill, root and branch, should rise and propose that the very clause which was for the protection of the immigrant should be left out.

Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 173; Noes, 132. (Division List No. 294.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW(Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt-ColHF.(Middlesex)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brymer, Wliliam Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hn. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Rt. HnAilwyn Edw.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Rt Hn SirR.B(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Maj. Evans(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred

Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hn. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, ArthurH (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hn. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Liddell, Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt HnWalter(Bristol, S)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macanochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh)
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.JH(Dumfriesshire
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Morgan, D J. (Walthamstow)
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
O'Neill, Hn. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peate, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt. Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, HC(North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt.Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col SirCEH(Sheffield)
Walrond, Rt. HnSirWm. H.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H. (Yorks
Wodehouse, Rt.HnE.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Allen, Charles P.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Clancy, John Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A.(Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, CaptEC(SAndrw'sBghs)
Evans, Samuel T.(Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Guest, Hn. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P(Cavan, W
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Camarthen)
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Richards, Thomas
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spencer, Rt Hn C.R(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Weir, James Galloway
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull,W.)
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Dalziel and Mr. Trevelyan.

*MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) moved to add at the end of Clause 2 a sub-section providing that one member of the immigration board should be a member of some *bona fide* organisation of workmen. He said that the qualifications for members of the boards were by no means of a satisfactory character. It was proposed that one member should have magisterial experience, another business experience, and the third administrative experience. These were very ambiguous descriptions, especially the second. He believed the really practical man would be found among the working-class organisations. At the time he placed the Amendment on the Paper he did not know that the members of the board would be paid for their services; he had expected that they would do the work gratuitously in the same way as Members of Parliament; therefore it was not with any intention of finding snug well-paid berths for working men that he made this proposal. But they were constantly told that the working classes would be immediately affected by the Bill, and, if that were so, what objection could there be to putting a member of a working class organisation on these boards? Men of the right type could easily be found; there were trades councils in every one of the eleven ports where immigration boards were to be set up, and representatives from these bodies would bring to bear on the work of the boards just that practical experience which was necessary. Such members by a few direct and technical questions would immediately ascertain whether immigrants were what they professed to be, would very quickly detect impostors, and he was convinced they would prove to be exceedingly valuable members of the boards. He expressly inserted the words "*bona fide* organisation," in order to prevent bounty-fed agitators connected with associations that were not financially supported by working men and which did not represent the working classes, from being placed on these boards. In the hope that the Home Secretary would see not only the advantage, but the absolute necessity of the class of appointment which he advocated, he begged to move.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid.), in seconding, said he thought an Amendment of this kind was necessary for the proper working of the measure. They had upon a previous occasion tried to introduce a clause to protect British labour, and they had been chided with claiming to be in favour of this Bill whilst they had been opposing it all through. However bad a Bill might be it was part of the duty of wise men to try their best to minimise the evils in it. They had tried to introduce an Amendment to keep out alien contract labour during strikes, but they had failed. He thought his hon. friend who had moved this Amendment had put the case fairly and clearly before the House, and if the Home Secretary could not accept this Amendment he hoped he would be able to frame some rule which would carry out this idea. The Home Secretary had laid down certain conditions which were necessary as qualifications for those who would be appointed to serve on the immigration boards, and he submitted to the right hon. Gentleman that there were connected with the great trades organisations in every port a number of men who possessed at least two of the qualifications out of the three required for the formation of these boards. The Home Secretary laid down as one qualification that they must be magisterial. He was aware that there were not many working men who were magistrates, and there ought to be more. The work done by the great trades organisations of this country had specially fitted men for serving on these boards. One of the qualifications laid down was that they must be business men. If a trades union leader fulfilled his position properly he was bound to have manifested before his appointment strong business capabilities. The class of people to be dealt with by these boards would be the very poor people, and he might mention that there was hardly a board of guardians in any part of the country upon which some working men had not made themselves thoroughly acquainted with the working of the Poor Law. For these reasons he thought the members of trade organisations were specially qualified for taking at least one of the positions on these boards. He thought that a working man was the best judge as to whether any of these immigrants were undesirables or not.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 20, at the end, to insert the words, '(3) Notwithstanding anything heretofore contained one member of the immigration board shall be a member of some *bona fide* organisation of workmen."—(*Mr. Cremer.*)—

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Major EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) said he found himself very largely in agreement with the proposer and seconder of the Amendment in what they had said as to the desirability of having a representative of the working classes at all events on the panel. There were a great many matters which would come before the board on which the opinion and advice of men acquainted with the industrial conditions of the locality would be of great value, and he hoped the Home Secretary would see his way to having the names of such men upon the panel, feeling sure that it would give confidence both to the immigrants and to the working classes.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) said he had a great deal of sympathy with the material part of the Amendment, but he could not accept it in the form in which it was moved. He was perfectly prepared to put persons accustomed to industrial matters on the panel, and he dared say that one of them would thus serve on the board in many instances, but that was a different thing to putting them on the panel and compelling the summoning officer always to summon one. He thought he showed his intention to the House the previous night; and he considered the word "business" would cover not only proprietors of businesses and manufacturers, but also those who had industrial experience. Certainly that was the sense in which he should construe the word when he administered the Act. The hon. Member for Manchester had handed in an Amendment to insert the word "industrial." He should have been perfectly prepared to accept that, and he thought it would to a large extent have met the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite; but the Amendment moved went very much further than that, and he could not accept it in its present form. The hon. Member, however, might take it that he did not differ from him in the desire to secure on the panel the experience of those dealing with the industrial classes, and who undoubtedly possessed a great deal of that information which they desired to get. He could not accept the Amendment as it was, and he did not think it was necessary, because he could assure the hon. Member that the representatives of the class which he desired would be put upon the panel, for they could undoubtedly do the immigration board a great deal of service. He had gone some way to meet the hon. Member; but, although he accepted the spirit of the Amendment, he could not accept the actual words.

Mr. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) said he thought a moments consideration would show that the concession made by the Home Secretary was not worth very much. It was no satisfaction to know that a representative of labour was to be put on the panel when perhaps he would never be called. There was no guarantee that the men whose names were upon the panel would be selected in rotation. They distinctly laid down the principle that there should be on the board a magistrate or man with magisterial experience; a man of business capacity; and a man of administrative skill; and they might have on the panel from now till Doomsday a representative of labour who would never be called to attend a single meeting of the board. He submitted that that was no satisfaction to them or those they represented. This was a question which more directly came home to the working classes than to any other class of the community. They were more interested in this question than either the magistrate, the business man, or the man of administrative capacity. The people to be dealt with by the boards were of their own class, and all their associations, sympathies, and aspirations were such as were born of men of their own class in this country. If, therefore, they wanted the Act to be smoothly administered they would do well to accept the Amendment. Although they appreciated the step the Home Secretary had taken in advance in the matter, practically it amounted to no concession at all.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) aid he recognised the spirit which the Home Secretary had shown in the matter, but he thought it would be more gracious and only just if he acceded entirely to the principle of the Amendment. By doing so he would be promoting and facilitating the successful working of the Bill. While it was most important that they should have on these boards men versed in legal technicalities and of strong and far-reaching capabilities, he submitted it was equally important that they should also have a working man, experienced in the difficulties of living, of providing food, and earning wages. With the experience so gained, a man would contribute valuable assistance to a righteous and just decision on the intricate questions which would come from time to time before the immigration board. It might be said that a working man might be here and there tempted to take action that would unduly keep out an immigrant who came here to compete with British labour. He believed, however, that the working man was as just and generous as members of other classes. But even if such cases did arise, his colleagues on the immigration board would certainly keep him right and see that justice was done all round. He earnestly hoped that the Government would be able to make this concession. It would be a gracious act, and at the same time one that would be only just, and that would greatly increase the confidence of the people of this country in the operation of this measure. It was a measure chiefly promoted in the interests of the lower classes, and the Amendment would increase the confidence of these classes.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) appealed to the Home Secretary to accept the Amendment. The Answer of the right hon. Gentleman was very sympathetic, but it showed how little he knew of the treatment of working men under certain circumstances. Even in this House, when they had been talking of labour-representation, the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had said that he was a labour representative. The words proposed by the Home Secretary might be stretched to include the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs as a representative of labour. He maintained that the knowledge which working men possessed in regard to people of their own class would be of great service when the boards were endeavouring to decide on questions whether the immigrants who came to this country were or were not desirable. Had the Home Secretary or the Lord Chancellor ever hea d any complaint of the discrimination or judicial capacity of the working-men magistrates throughout the length and breadth of the land? Was not the satisfactory manner in which they discharged their duties conclusive proof that they had the faculty for this kind of work? He was against the Bill, but, if it was to be passed, he desired to have it amended in such a manner as would make it less objectionable than it otherwise would be.

*MR. RENWICK said that during the discussions on this Bill shipowners had been endeavouring to devise means by which immigrants could be landed immediately. In some instances it might be necessary to land them on condition of their being examined ashore by the immigration board. He wished to point out the inconvenience and delay which might arise in dealing with cases if working men were put on the boards. Ships arrived at all hours of the day and night, and it would be impossible to get working men to attend the sittings of the board at the times when their presence might be most desirable. Shipowners wanted men who were on the spot and who could be called immediately to settle important questions as to debarkation. While he had nothing to say against working men representatives generally, he thought that in this case it would be a mistake to appoint them members of these boards. He sincerely trusted that the Home Secretary would not accept the Amendment.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said he could assure the House that working men could attend. He spoke as one who had had very great experience of *bona fide* working men in connection with their organisations. In the county of Durham a system prevailed under which employers were brought into almost daily contact with the workmen's unions, and he could state that the training these men got in dealing with business matters was such as would enable them to deal with the questions which would come before them on the immigration boards. The present chairman of the County Council of Durham was the Member for Mid-Durham. There were many men of his type in the county of Northumberland. There was not a member of that council, from the Duke of Northumberland downwards, socially, who would not agree with him in saying that among the working men were some of the very best representatives they had. He was sorry the Home Secretary could not see his way to ensure there should be always a working man on the board. He had come into contact with working men who were certainly fitted to represent any district upon these boards. In the county of Durham many working men were chairmen of district councils, and consequently were magistrates, and he had never heard a complaint against them of not being able to properly discharge their duties.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he was in favour of the Amendment. He understood that the basis on which the Bill was introduced was that aliens who were economically undesirable should be prevented from coming into the country. If that was the basis on which it had been brought forward, he thought the Home Secretary would agree that the best man to decide whether an alien was desirable or not was a working man. He hoped the Home Secretary would reconsider his decision.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) asked how the working man would be chosen out of the panel when ships arrived. Could the right hon. Gentleman say whether they would be taken in rotation or picked out arbitrarily by some particular official?

MR. CHURCHILL (Oldham) said it seemed to him that the request made in this Amendment was a reasonable one. After all, the great bulk of immigrants belonged to those classes who in foreign countries were called the working classes. It did not seem extravagant to request that one of the members of the board should be one of their own class in this country who would most readily appreciate the conditions which had induced those foreigners to seek refuge on our shores.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 168; Noes, 217. (Division List No. 295.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Allen, Charles P.
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Chas. (Poplar)
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph

Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M.Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, Wllliam
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.Ed
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, RtHnHerbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Guest, Hn. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law,Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Richards, Thomas
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw Chas. Edw.(Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spencer, Rt. Hn.CR(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry(Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Cremer and Mr. John Wilson (Durham)

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, RtHnHughO.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fetcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHnA.J (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col.HF(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, RtHn. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJA (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T.(S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Coston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Rt Hn Ailwyn Edw.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J(Man'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, RtHnSirR.B(Inv'rn'ss)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A.G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Maj. Evans(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs)
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir Jas. (Staffords, N.W.
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H
Kenyon Hn. Geo. T (Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, A. H. (Hants, Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Liddell, Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hn. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S.G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, H.C(North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Welby, Lt.Col A.C.E. (Taunton)
Welby, Sir Charles G.E(Notts)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H(Yorks)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E.R(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 30, after the word 'fine,' to insert the words 'or of an offence under paragraph twenty-two or twenty-three of section three hundred and eighty-one of The Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892, or of an offence as a prostitute under Section seventy-two of The Towns Improvement (Ireland) Act, 1854, or paragraph eleven of Section fifty-four of the Metropolitan Police Act, 1839.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) moved as an Amendment to strike out Sub-section 2 of Clause 4 on the ground that to make the master of a ship responsible for six months for the good behaviour of aliens which he had brought to this country was unfair. How on earth was a ship's captain to know the character of a passenger on his ship, and how could he be made responsible for the conduct of such a passenger six months after that passenger had left his ship? The scheme was unfair in principle, and would be unworkable in practice.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 20, to leave out Sub-section (2) of Clause 4."—(*Mr. Leif Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said that the sub-section was argued at considerable length in Committee, and he hoped the Amendment would not be pressed. The sub-section would tend to make the ship-owner more careful.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 244; Noes, 177. (Division List No. 296.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Arroll, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. SirH.
Bagot, Capt Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt.Hn.GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Fredrk. George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F.(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts,
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbysh.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.JA(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hn. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir WilliamTheodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hn. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Rt HnAilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ(Manc'r)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Rt.Hn.SirR.B(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Maj Evans(T rHamlets
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hn. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hn. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, Sir Jas. (Staffords, N. W
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herb. Merton
Kennaway, Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo.T. (Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hn. Fredk. Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn. H.L.W.(Mile End
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Liddell, Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, RtHn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt.HnSirH.E(Wigt'n)
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton

Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, Ed. (Fermanagh, N.)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hn. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hn. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H. C. (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, Rt Hn J Parker (Lanarks
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C E H (Sheffield)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col A C E (Taunton)
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry W.
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Allen, Charles P.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bond, Edward
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N. E. (York, NR Whitby
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S Andrw's Bghs
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Guest, Hn. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, V. P. (Cavan, W.)
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Arthur Wm. (Cornwall)
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kean, John
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M‘Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Richards, Thomas
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj JEB (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spencer, Rt Hn C R (Northants)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, J. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Leif Jones and Mr. Emmott.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of July 5th, to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 7, line 29, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'on an appeal to an immigration board.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 7, line 33, after the word 'character,' to insert the words 'or whether a crime is an extradition crime.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 7, line 34, to leave out the words from the first 'State,' to the end of line 35, and insert the words 'in accordance with rules made under this Act, and the Board shall act in accordance with his decision.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time Tomorrow, and to be printed. [Bill 277.]

EAST INDIA LOANS [RAILWAYS].

Resolution reported—

"That it is expedient to authorise the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise in the United Kingdom on the security of the Revenues of India, by the creation and issue of capital stock, bonds, debentures, or bills, a sum, not exceeding £20,000,000, for the following purposes:—

(*a*) The construction, extension, and equipment of Railways in India by State Agency or through the Agency of Companies.

(*b*) The repayment of the principal of any bonds or debentures issued by any such company under the guarantee of the Secretary of State.

(*c*) The discharge of any obligations incurred by the Secretary of State by reason of the purchase of any railway or the determination of any contract from or with such company."

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) asked the Secretary of State for India to give some explanation with regard to the £20,000,000 which it was proposed to borrow under this Resolution. If he did so, the progress of the Bill might be promoted. He noticed that the Resolution authorised the raising of £20,000,000 in the United Kingdom upon the security of the revenues of India. He supposed that the ordinary rule would be followed and half the money would be raised in India. He assumed that it would not be necessary to have a Resolution of this House in order to raise part of this loan in India. If half the money was raised in India it would be raised at 3½ per cent., whilst if raised in this country the interest would be 3 per cent. In the year 1903–4 the Government got more money in this country at 3 per cent. than they got in India at 3½ per cent. They might affect a saving to India by getting the whole amount at 3 per cent. in this country, and he therefore wished to have an explanation from the Secretary for India upon this point. If the security was the same, India should not be burdened with 3½ per cent. unless there was some special purpose to be served. Some of this money was for the purpose of taking over the Bombay - Baroda line. He understood that the policy of the Government was to extend the railway system in India, and that was a policy which was approved of upon both sides of the House. He hoped that upon the Second Reading the right hon. Gentleman would give then a full statement of the purposes for which this loan was required and more particulars about the extensions. As this country had practically the management of the affairs of India, it was necessary to show that when matters came before this House affecting India they received some attention instead of being passed without anything being said about them.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) said the money was to be applied to railway purchase and railway construction in India; and spread over the whole of the railways in India it gave a capital invested at the rate of nearly 5 per cent. That was a position to which he thought no other country in the world could afford a parallel. It was true that a rupee loan in India could only be raised at 3½ per cent.; but the Government had adopted the principle that money should be borrowed as largely as possible in the country where it was to be expended. That was the justification for paying a higher rate of interest in India than was paid in Great Britain. It was imperative that they should have this additional borrowing power at the earliest possible date, because the greatest object to be attained at present was the development of the resources of India. He hoped the House would confirm the decision of the Committee.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire) approved of the policy of borrowing a portion of the money in India.

Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means and Mr. Secretary Brodrick.

EAST INDIA LOANS (RAILWAYS) BILL.

"To empower the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise money in the United Kingdom for the construction, extension, and equipment of Railways in India by State agency or through the agency of companies; and for other purposes," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 278.]

LUNACY BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

PRIZE COURTS BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

MEDICAL ACT (1886) AMENDMENT BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) explained that the Bill was intended to carry out the principle of reciprocity between the mother country and Canada in the matter of medical education. A special reason for the introduction of the Bill was that during the war in South Africa a number of medical men volunteered to serve with the Army, but the War Office said it was contrary to our law for them to attend a British soldier or to hold any official appointment. This Bill would enable these doctors to enter the service of this country as if they had been born here, and would also give an opportunity to any medical man going from this country to take up his profession in Canada. He trusted that the House would agree to the Third Reading.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said he did not rise to object to this Bill. He had a difficulty in regard to this measure, and he thought it was only right that he should inform the House what it was. Already they had reciprocity between this country and their Colonies, and so far so good. In the case of Canada the reciprocity could only be through the central Government in Canada. It also happened that there was Home Rule in Canada. They had local Governments there, and some of them might refuse to give reciprocity to medical men in this country. Under this Bill those provincial councils would come in to reap the benefit.

GENERAL LAURIE: No.

MR. CALDWELL said he did not think that our medical men could go to those provincial localities and practice, whereas anyone could come from Canada to this country and practice. He would not press his objection now, but he thought that it was only right that he should state his reasons for objecting. These questions were always carefully considered by him, and whenever they came up he could always give a substantial reason why he objected to any Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

TOWN TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) moved the omission of Clause 1, which confers on a tenant to which the Bill applies the right to compensation for improvements. There was nothing in the clause to limit the proposal in the Bill to tenants in towns. The first few lines said—

> "Subject to the provisions of this Act, a tenant of a holding to which this Act applies may, on quitting his holding, be entitled to claim, in the prescribed manner, compensation to be paid by the landlord in respect of all improvements on his holding made by him or his predecessors in title, which have added to the letting value of the holding."

He had always understood a holding to be a farm in the country and not a house in a town. It was most important in all Acts of Parliament that there should be no loophole on which an action could be founded and law expenses incurred. That was the reason why the clause should be left out in order, perhaps, that one more clear might be inserted. He objected to the clause also because it was retrospective. He argued that it was contrary to all sound principles of contract to enact that where an agreement had been freely entered into between two parties the bargain should be altered solely to the advantage of one of the parties. That seemed to him to be an infringement of all justice and an act which on his side of the House they would do their best to prevent. Another part of the clause said that the Court, in awarding compensation to the tenant in respect of improvements—

> "May, in reduction of the tenant's claim, take into consideration the rent at which such holding had been held, and any benefits which the tenant may have received from his landlord in consideration expressly or impliedly of the improvements made."

He did not understand the clause, and he was not sure that anybody else did. It seemed to have been drafted for the purpose of making work for lawyers and for adding to the expenses of the tenants and the equally unfortunate landlords. He begged to move.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.), in seconding the Amendment, said this Bill seemed to him to be one of the most pernicious that could be directed against the interests of the owners of town holdings in Ireland. As showing the unfair way in which the Bill would work, he instanced the case of a tenant who had built a billiard room at the back of his house. Supposing a man wished to buy a house to which a billiard room had been added, according to the scheme of this Bill, not only would he have to pay for the actual cost of the billiard room, but something in addition—the increased value of the house caused by the building of the billiard room.

Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put"; but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Will the hon. Member kindly go home?

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTSON said that what he wanted was to get the important principle contained in this clause settled once for all. [Interruption from the Irish Benches.] Hon. Members did not seem to appreciate the point.

An HON. MEMBER on the IRISH BENCHES: We do not appreciate your conduct.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTSON said that if hon. Gentlemen were anxious to come to a division he was perfectly willing for them to do so. He therefore seconded the Amendment to leave out Clause 1.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Subject to the provisions of this Act a tenant' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. CLANCY said that the Bill had been carried on the Second Reading by a large majority and it had been thoroughly threshed out in the Standing Committee. Without further remark he invited the House to reject the Amendment.

Lord HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said that this clause furnished a remarkable illustration of the value of a principle which was often derided, but which had a very real foundation in fact, the principle of resisting what was called the thin edge of the wedge. In 1870 Mr. Gladstone passed a Bill to give compensation to agricultural tenants in Ireland for improvements.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said that the Irish tenants were not in the same position as English tenants.

Lord HUGH CECIL admitted that the Irish agricultural tenants were in a very special position, and that was why Parliament was asked to intervene on their behalf; but that was no reason why the precedent should be followed and compensation be given to a wholly different class of tenants.

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

TRADE MARKS (RECOMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported; as amended; to be considered to-morrow.

Adjourned at seven minutes after
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 19th July, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Littlehampton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. As amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Acton District) Bill [Lords]; South Lancashire Tramways Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Central London Railway Bill (by Order); Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 2) Bill (by Order). Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

North East London Railway Bill. Ordered, That Standing Orders 84, 214, 215, and 239 be suspended. and that the Bill be now taken into consideration.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill, as amended, considered accordingly. Bill to be read the third time.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) (No. 2) Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

County of London Electric Supply Company Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).

Sir Alexander Hargreaves Brown reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned until Friday, at half-past Eleven o'clock. Report to lie upon the Table.

Sandgate Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

LONDON BUILDING ACTS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Moved, That, in the case of the London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill, Standing Orders 84, 214, and 239 be suspended, and that the Bill be now taken into consideration (provided amended prints shall have been previously deposited).—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Mr. CUMMING MACDONA (Southwark, Rotherhithe): I object.

Mr. BAILEY (Newington, Walworth) appealed to his hon. friend to withdraw his objection. There had been a meeting with the agents on both sides that morning, with the result that a very satisfactory and liberal arrangement had been come to.

Mr. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) also trusted that the objection would be withdrawn.

Mr. CUMMING MACDONA persisted, and the Motion stood over.

PETITIONS.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN BILL.

Petition from Newport, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Birmingham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

Return [presented 18th July]; to be printed. [No. 246.]

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 18th July, 1905, upon the recommendations of the University Colleges

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Committee [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL WORKS.

Copy presented, of Memorandum showing the Works upon which Expenditure is proposed to be provided for under the Naval Works Bill of the present Session [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AFRICA (No. 5, 1905).

Copy presented, of Award of His Majesty the King of Italy respecting the Western Boundary of the Barotse Kingdom. With a Map [by Command]: to lie upon the Table.

JAPAN (No. 1, 1905).

Copy presented of Award of the Arbitration Tribunal appointed to pronounce on certain questions as to the Interpretation of Treaties with Japan with regard to Leases held in Perpetuity [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3442 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Union of Benefices Act (Saint Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor and Saint Benet Fink). Copy of Scheme under The Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting a Union of the Benefices of Saint Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor and Saint Benet Fink [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Compensation to Albert Blake for Wrongful Imprisonment.

Sir THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state what compensation it is proposed to grant to Albert Blake, of Wandsworth, who was recently wrongfully convicted on a charge of robbery, and sentenced to twenty-one days imprisonment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) In view of all the circumstances, this is not a case in which compensation could properly be granted from the Exchequer. The police have given Blake a small gratuity, in consideration of the loss of three days work which was caused by the mistaken identification, and Blake has expressed his satisfaction with it. He was convicted, not of robbery, but of larceny of a flower-pot.

Chinese Coolies in British North Borneo.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state the number of Chinese coolies imported into British North Borneo since the company's charter was granted.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) His Majesty's Government are not in possession of the information desired by the hon. Member.

Mürzsteg Programme—Exemption from One Year's Taxation of Christian Villages Burnt in 1903.

Mr. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what steps have been taken to enforce the Article of the Mürzsteg programme providing for exemption from one year's taxation for Christian villages burnt in 1903.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) According to the information received by His Majesty's Government it would appear that the inhabitants of villages destroyed during the insurrection have in general been exempted from one year's taxation or have received relief in some other form.

Sheep Stolen from Michael O'Connor, at Gortfada.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Michael O'Connor, of Gortfada, reported to the Sneem police, on 5th February, that nine sheep had been stolen from him; and can he state what steps were taken by the police to recover those sheep.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) On 20th November last O'Connor reported to the police that ten of his sheep were missing, and that he thought they might have strayed. Four of the missing sheep were, a few days later, found straying on an adjacent mountain. The police from two neighbouring stations were out searching for the remaining sheep for many days, but without avail. The district is a mountainous one.

Officials of Irish Agricultural Department.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the names of the officials engaged in the Irish Agricultural Department in the drafting and writing of correspondence, the conducting of registries, and interviewing callers on public business respectively; and whether he will state the amount of salary paid in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) It would, in my opinion, serve no useful public purpose to give this information. The Answer to the Question is therefore in the negative.

Allocation of Spirit Licence Duties in Ireland.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the statement of accounts showing the allocation of Spirit Licence Duties in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The Irish share of the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Duties for the year 1904–5 was £128,385 6s. 10d. The allocation of this amount, in pursuance of statute, was as follows:—£78,000 to the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction; and the balance, viz., £50,385 6s. 10d., to the Intermediate Education Board.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

South African War—Salaries of Press Censors.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Chesterfield Division of Derbyshire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether there was any salary attaching to the post of Press censor in South Africa during the Boer War; and, if so, will he state the amount, and say whether this was additional to the pay to which the officer holding this post was entitled on active service.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The chief censor was graded as an assistant adjutant-general on headquarters staff and received £800 a year. Other officers employed on censorship duties were graded as deputy assistant adjutant-generals, receiving £1 1s. a day, or as staff captains, receiving 15s. a day, according to the nature of the duties they performed. There was no special rate of pay for censors.

MR. CATHCART WASON: Was this in addition to their pay as officers?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER was understood to reply that those who were officers had also the pay of their rank.

The Proposed Reduction of the Volunteer Force—Test of Efficiency.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Edinburgh, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state whether the reports of general officers commanding districts as to the efficiency of Volunteer units will be based on the standard of fitness for service abroad; whether the proposed reduction in numbers will be determined by fitness for service abroad; and if the information requested in Army Council Circular of July 11th, 1905, as to fitness for service abroad, is a compulsory demand, and is in accordance with the Volunteer Regulations.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Answers to the first two Questions are in the negative. The circular letter is in the shape of an order and is worded in accordance with the custom in His Majesty's Army, and I have every confidence that commanding officers of

Volunteer corps will do their utmost to comply with its conditions.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN: Then may I take it that service abroad is not to be the test for the general body of Volunteers?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am unable to understand how that impression can have arisen. I have said the Answer is in the negative.

War Office Finance Branch.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, during the war, the finance branch of the Army had practically nothing to do, while the contracts branch was overwhelmed with work; and whether the finance branch gave its men to the contracts branch.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I think the expression used by me in debate was calculated to create a wrong impression and to do an injustice to a very hard-working section of the *personnel* of the War Office. What I intended to indicate was that the work of examination and audit was of necessity for a time suspended, but not that those who were charged with this work were unoccupied. On the contrary, I believe that they shared the very heavy general burden which fell on the office. I was inexact in stating that transfers were made from the finance branch to the contracts branch; the contracts branch was largely reinforced from other sources; but there were important transfers in the finance branch itself. I am glad to have this opportunity of correcting a wrong impression, which I had no desire to create, and I thank the hon. Member for giving me the opportunity.

Indian Army Administration—The Viceroy's Speech.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the report of the speech, contained in *The Times* of to-day, delivered yesterday in the Viceregal Council by the Viceroy of India, in which the decision of His Majesty's Government with reference to the administration of the Indian Army, and the despatch of the Secretary of State conveying that decision to the Viceroy, are criticised, I might say severely, if not offensively; secondly, what is the prerogative which the Viceroy says was conceded to the Government of India three-quarters of a century ago, and which Lord Curzon alleges it to be his bounden duty to sustain; thirdly, whether the Secretary of State will take the earliest opportunity of informing the House of the course which the Government proposes to take with reference to this extraordinary speech.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I have telegraphed to the Viceroy requesting him to telegraph, for the information of His Majesty's Government, the text of the speech which he delivered in the Legislative Council yesterday. Until I receive it I cannot make any statement of the views of His Majesty's Government upon the subject.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the third Question.

MR. BRODRICK: I hope to be able to make some statement early next week.

Spirit for Manufacturing Purposes—Regulations.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the rules and regulations made by the Board of Inland Revenue for the sale and manufacture of spirits for manufacturing purposes are out of print; and when the new regulations proposed will be printed.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): If the Revenue Bill which is now before the House passes, the instructions referred to in the Question will require considerable alteration. In that event the new regulations will be printed as early as possible. If the Bill does not pass, I will have the old regulations reprinted with any modifications that are required to bring them up to date.

MR. EUGENE WASON: Will the right hon. Gentleman let me have a copy of the old regulations?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am afraid they are out of print.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Will the right hon. Gentleman furnish me with particulars as to chicory as promised? The absence of them may delay the Bill.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Gentleman will see me in my private room I will try to give him the information he requires, and will have samples ready.

Customs Watchers.

MR. CAUSTON (Southwark, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state what, if any, concessions he is prepared to make in answer to the petition of the Customs watchers.

MR. CAUSTON: I beg also to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will now give an answer to the petition of the upper section non-pensioner watchers which was presented in November last.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): I regret to say that I am not yet in a position to make a statement on these questions. The matter is receiving very careful consideration.

MR. CAUSTON: Shall I have an Answer to the Question before the Vote comes on in this House?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I will endeavour to give it by then.

British Fruit Industry.

*MR. HIGHAM (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if it is the intention of the Board to take action in accordance with the recommendations of the Departmental Committee which has recently inquired into and reported upon the fruit industry of Great Britain.

MR. HIGHAM: I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he is aware of the fact that many rating authorities increase the assessments, in the case of land devoted to the growing of fruit, from the earliest years after the planting of the fruit trees; and if he will introduce early legislation to give effect to recommendation No. 15 of the Departmental Committee upon Fruit Industry, that the assessments should not be raised for a period of five years after the planting in the case of small fruit, of seven years in the case of mixed plantations, and twelve years in the case of orchards.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES, Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): The various recommendations of the Committee will receive my careful consideration, but I cannot as yet say to what extent it may be possible for me to give effect to them. The evidence upon which the recommendations are based is not as yet available, and it would not in any case be practicable for me to initiate legislation on the subject this session.

Anthrax in Devonshire.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether his attention has been directed to several outbreaks of anthrax in the county of Devon, and whether he has taken the necessary measures for spreading information amongst agriculturists and others to counteract the ravages of this disease.

*MR. AILWYN FELLOWES: The prevalence of anthrax in the county of Devon has for some time past been receiving our special attention and we are in communication with the local authority with respect to it. A notice calling attention to the dangerous character of the disease and to the risk attending the cutting up of the carcases of affected animals was issued to every owner of stock in the county last autumn. In addition, a leaflet on the subject has been widely distributed throughout the county by the police, and our inspectors are instructed to give the matter their special attention when making inquiries in connection with outbreaks of the disease. I shall be happy to supply copies of the notice and leaflet to the hon. Member for his information.

Pollution of the Thames Estuary.

Mr. COHEN (Islington, E.): On behalf of the senior Member for the City of London, I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has yet received any replies from the local authorities of Faversham and Whitstable in regard to the discharge from those places of crude sewage into the Thames Estuary; and, if so, what is the nature of those replies.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): I have received replies from the local authorities referred to, who contend that in the circumstances of their districts they would not be justified in incurring the expenditure necessary for carrying out works for the treatment of the sewage. I shall be happy to forward copies of these communications to my right hon. friend if he desires to see them.

Work for the Unemployed—Obsolete Acts.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, seeing that under the Act 42 Eliz., c. 2, and subsequent Acts, boards of guardians may, with the consent of the Local Government Board, acquire fifty acres of land in each parish upon which to set the able-bodied poor to work, and to pay them reasonable wages for their work, he will call the attention of boards of guardians to these enactments, and suggest their application as a method of relieving the rates from the burden of maintaining able-bodied men and women in idleness.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The enactments referred to have for many years been considered as obsolete, and have not been acted upon by boards of guardians since the passing of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834. I could not undertake to comply with the suggestion of the hon. Member that the attention of boards of guardians should be called to them.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: The right hon. Gentleman says these enactments are obsolete, but could not any local authority put them into operation if it chose?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: There would be nothing illegal in so doing; but if I were, as requested, to call attention to them it might be thought I was advising that they be enforced.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): On what ground is an Act of Parliament considered obsolete? Is the Act of Edward III. obsolete?

[No Answer was returned.]

The Holborn Borough Council Disclosures—Case of Mr. L. H. Isaacs.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to the proceedings of the Holborn Borough Council on the 12th inst., when the council declined to carry into effect the recommendation of its own special investigation committee that Mr. Lewis H. Isaacs be proceeded against under the provisions of the Statutory Declaration Act of 1835; and, if so, what steps the Local Government Board intend to take in respect to this condonation of this official's conduct.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I understand that the borough council have recorded their strong condemnation of Mr. Isaacs' conduct, but have not adopted the recommendation of the committee that proceedings should be taken against him. It was competent for the Council to determine whether they would take such proceedings or not, and the Local Government Board have no control over them in the matter.

Mr. FLYNN: May I ask if this man, by making restitution of a sum of money and by submitting to a large reduction of pension did not admit the fraud, and have not the Local Government Board condoned that fraud by assenting to the action of the local council?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: It is a question for the local board and not for the Local Government Board.

Mr. FLYNN: Cannot action be taken by the Public Prosecutor, as would have been done had it occurred in Ireland?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not think it ought to be taken on this occasion.

The Cornewall Statue.

Sir ELLIOTT LEES (Birkenhead): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether the drawings relating to the proposed removal of a national monument, erected by Parliament in Westminster Abbey to the memory of Captain Cornewall in 1744, which the First Commissioner suggested should be laid before the other House of Parliament, may be laid before this House also.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): The First Commissioner will be happy to ask the Dean of Westminster for another copy for the use of the House of Commons.

Sir ELLIOTT LEES was understood to ask that the plans should show the available floor space?

Lord BALCARRES: I will convey that wish to the First Commissioner. It is an outlined drawing and not a shaded drawing, I think.

Sir ELLIOTT LEES: And will the wish be conveyed to the Dean of Westminster?

Lord BALCARRES assented.

Prosecutions of Scottish Anti-Vaccinationists.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if he will state the number of prosecutions of vaccination defaulters in Scotland during the current year, and for each year during the last five years.

The LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton): The information which would enable me to answer the first part of the hon. Member's Question is not yet procurable. The prosecutions for the five years ended 30th June, 1904, are:—For 1900, 59; for 1901, 108; for 1902, 56; for 1903, 82; for 1904, 73.

Sneem Steamer Service.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board has received a memorial from the residents of Sneem district with reference to the withdrawal of the steamer service; and, if so, can he state what action the Board will take in the matter.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.): The memorial has been considered by the Board, who have decided that they can take no further steps in the matter.

Netterville Estate, Galway.

Mr. REDDY (King's County, Birr): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Galway, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the farm of Woodbrook, part of the Netterville Estate, in the county of Galway, has been purchased by the Congested Districts Board; and, if so, whether, in view of the number of uneconomic holdings surrounding this farm, it is the intention of the Board to convert them into economic ones by an increase of land from the Woodbrook Farm.

Mr. WALTER LONG: This farm has been purchased by the Board for the purpose of enlarging the small holdings of their tenants on the adjacent Fallon Estate. The Board do not intend to dispose of the land to others than their own tenants.

Mr. O'Hara Trenche's Estate, Galway.

Mr. REDDY: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Galway, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that upon last November the tenants on Mr. O'Hara Trenche's property at New Inn, county Galway, entered into negotiations with the owner for the purchase of their holdings, together with some untenanted land, that the price had been agreed to, and that in consequence of the tenants refusing to give up their game rights Mr. O'Hara Trenche sold portions of the estate, upon which seven tenants are living, to Lord Ashtown, and that Mr. Mahon, the agent, now threatens the remainder of the tenants that if they do not accept the landlord's terms they shall also be sold over to Lord Ashtown; and, if so, will he say what steps he intends to take to prevent tenants from being subjected to such compulsion.

Mr. WALTER LONG: No proceedings for the sale of this estate have come before the Estates Commissioners, who have therefore no means of knowing whether the facts are as stated.

Mr. REDDY: Will you prevent Lord Ashtown buying over the heads of these tenants?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I have no power to do that.

Crime in County Cork.

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the remarks of Mr. Justice Kenny, at the opening of the County Cork Assizes on the 14th instant, in which he said that the calendar for a large county like Cork could not be considered heavy, but that other matters had been brought under his notice which showed that there had been a considerable increase in that kind of intimidation which takes the form of threatening letters and notices; whether he can say if information of this character was furnished to the Judge by the constabulary authorities; and, if so, what steps are taken to test the genuineness of these alleged intimidatory notices, and what opportunity can be afforded the House of testing the reliability of the figures furnished by the police.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Yes, Sir, I have seen a report in the Press, according to which the learned Judge made remarks to the effect mentioned. The information upon which these remarks were based was, as is perfectly well understood, supplied by the police. As compared with the corresponding assize period of last year, the number of cases of intimidation by threatening letters or notices and otherwise had risen from seven to twenty. As I informed the hon. Member on May 29th,† every possible care is taken that none but genuine cases of intimidation are included in the returns. It is obvious that no opportunity of checking the figures can be afforded to the House.

Mr. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is a widespread belief in Ireland that these returns are manipulated officially?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I am aware there are many beliefs prevalent in Ireland which have no foundation.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): Have these letters resulted in injury to either person or property?

Mr. WALTER LONG: Obviously I cannot answer that without notice.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Has the intimidation arisen since the right hon. Gentleman became Chief Secretary?

Mr. WALTER LONG: No, Sir.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): If a policeman swears injury is malicious, and the County Court Judge holds it is not, is it returned as a malicious injury? Who is the judge? What is a malicious inquiry.

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish National Education Commissioners' Report.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, when presenting the Annual Report for 1904 of the Commissioners of National Education, he will arrange to lay upon the Table of the House at the same time a copy of the statement or protest which records on behalf of six of the Commissioners present at the Board meeting of the 4th instant their total dissent from the portions of the draft Report for 1904 which deals with Rule 127 (b) and with the amalgamation of schools, and will he at the same time state by whom this protest was signed.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxlvii., 86.

MR. WALTER LONG: The reply to both Questions is in the affirmative.

MR. BOLAND: Will the Report and the protest be laid separately?

MR. WALTER LONG: I cannot say.

Irish National Education Rules.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in connection with the volume of rules of the National Board for 1905, which the Commissioners state was adopted at the Board meeting of December 20th, 1904, he will ascertain from the Commissioners whether the new Rules 127 (b) and 186 were discussed in detail, or at all, at the said meeting of December 20th, 1904; and whether these rules as published were based on any official returns, previously made out, showing how the interests of the teaching staffs would be affected by the operation of these rules.

MR. WALTER LONG: The rules mentioned were not discussed in detail at the meeting of December 20th, 1904, as they had already been discussed and adopted at the meeting of October 25th. The Commissioners do not consider it desirable to make public the returns or other documents considered by them when revising their rules.

MR. BOLAND: Were the rules based on official returns?

MR. WALTER LONG: I cannot give an Answer to that without referring to the Commissioners.

Irish Parliamentary Representation.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state if any official records are available as to the views held in 1884 by the late Marquess of Salisbury and the late Sir Stafford Northcote on the subject of the reduction of the Irish representation below the number fixed by the Act of Union.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am not aware of any official record of this matter.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in 1885, when it was proposed to reduce the Irish representation by ten, it was opposed by Sir Stafford Northcote and the Tory Party?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not see that that has anything to do with the Question on the Paper.

Use of Submarines for War.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will communicate with foreign Governments with a view to abolish the use of submarine vessels for purposes of war.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman, though made with, I am sure, the most humanitarian intentions, is really practicable.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the majority by which the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill passed its Second Reading, of the fact that Irish Members of all political Parties voted for the Bill, and of the demand from Ireland that it should become law this session, he will provide time for passing the Bill through its remaining stages in this House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: This is a private Bill, and the rule in regard to private Bills is that no special privileges can be granted towards the end of the session unless they are of an uncontentious character. I have no ground for supposing that that is true of the Bill in which the hon. Gentleman takes a special interest.

Lord Roberts and Army Efficiency.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if Lord Roberts has informed the Defence Committee that our armed forces as a body are as absolutely unfitted and unprepared for war as they were in 1899-1900; and what steps are being taken to remedy the defects indicated by that officer.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I should, in no circumstances, state to the House what a particular member of the Defence Committee said on any particular occasion. Quite apart from that general principle I may remind the hon. Gentleman that it is not the business of the Defence Committee to deal with Army reform, which is in the province of the Secretary of State for War.

Mr. LAMBERT: Is it not the business of the Government to see that our armed forces are in a state of efficiency?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: That is the business of the Government as a whole, no doubt, but of the Secretary of State for War and the Army Council in particular.

The Discussion of Supply.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the inroads that have been made this session on the days allotted to Supply by means of contentious Private Business and Motions for Adjournment, he will consider the advisability of moving that the usual extra three days shall be devoted to Supply; and, if not, will he state the reasons that induce him to depart from precedent in this matter.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The only inroad made on the time of the House by way of Motion for Adjournment proceeding from the Government side of the House was, I think, the one made in connection with West Ham. Supply has been taken on sixteen days and parts of days, in addition to the counting days; and, in my opinion, the general state of public business quite justifies, I will not say the resolution at which I have arrived, but the plan which seems to me most convenient, that on this occasion the House should forego the extra three days commonly voted to Supply. I do not think we have been peculiarly unfortunate—my general impression is that we have been rather fortunate—in the number of contentious private Bills this session.

Mr. DALZIEL: More contentious Bills have, as a matter of fact, been put down this session than in almost any previous session. Is it not the fact that the extra three days were to be given in respect of the state of Supply and not of the particular arrangement of public business?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not accept the proposition of the hon. Member Still, I can inquire into the number of Bills. I do not think it was ever suggested that the three extra days should be given quite irrespective of the general condition of public business.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Will the right hon. Gentleman make arrangements to enable us, in addition to the three counting days for Irish Supply, to have at any rate some discussion on the Irish Development Grant Fund, the importance of discussing which I am sure he will admit?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR reminded the hon. Gentleman that they had had at least one important purely Irish discussion altogether outside the time devoted to Irish Supply, as the hon. Gentleman secured first place in the debate on the Motion for moving the Speaker out of the Chair on the Civil Service Estimates.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Have we not some special claim, seeing how we assisted the right hon. Gentleman to save several days debate on the Redistribution Resolution?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I admit our debt of gratitude to the hon. Gentleman, but he must not be too exacting.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) asked whether it was not the fact that, under the Standing Order, any Member could put down a Motion for the extra three days, which must be divided upon without Amendment or debate, and that it was not restricted to a Minister.

MR. LOUGH asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would agree that this was a question to be settled by the general opinion of the House rather than by himself absolutely.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR replied that he did not think so. No doubt the House would like to have the three extra days, but he had to survey the general course of business, and in consequence of the survey he had made he had come to the conclusion he had already indicated. He thought it must be left to the Leader of the House, and to him alone, to give an opinion on this point. He might be mistaken in the decision he had come to, but he was bound to look to the broader considerations.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: May I conclude that, if a private Member puts down a Motion, the right hon. Gentleman would not give an opportunity for a vote upon it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): We must assume from the reply of the right hon. Gentleman that there is such an intolerable quantity of legislation that there is no room for the usual discussion of Supply, which is in a worse position this year than we have ever known it. Will the right hon. Gentleman say what this great mass of legislation is which is crushing Supply almost out of existence, because we are not able to discern it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman, no doubt unintentionally, misinterprets what I said. I presume that no one in the position of the right hon. Gentleman opposite will deny that the general condition of public business, as well as the state of Supply, must be considered in determining this question. So far as I know, Supply has absorbed a quite abnormal amount of time during the present session [OPPOSITION cries of "No"], while the time available for the transaction of legislative business has been unusually small.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: May I point out that of the eleven classes of Votes six or seven have never been discussed at all. I believe I am within the mark when I say that less time has been given to Supply this session than in any previous session during the Prime Minister's tenure of office.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the right hon. Gentleman has spoken somewhat hastily, but it might be useful if he would put a Question on the Paper asking for the number of counting days, and the number of days or parts of days which are not counting days, which have been occupied in the discussion of Supply in the present session.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I will put a Question down.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): The non-counting days really apply to the Supply of last year.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What I want to impress on the House is that it is impossible within the limits of time at the disposal of the House to give so much time to Supply when it is required for legislation.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman, in reckoning the time given to Supply, was counting the days devoted to Supplementary Estimates.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Certainly.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Supplementary Estimates were really due to the defects of the Departments under the right hon. Gentleman's charge. Had the right hon. Gentleman deliberately come to the conclusion that twenty days were sufficient for the discussion of Supply, or was he refusing the three extra days simply because of the special circumstances of this session?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The time given to Supply outside the twenty days may, in the opinion of the hon. Gentleman, be due to the incompetence of the present Government, but it is not due to that in my opinion, and this question of dispute between us is one which I am afraid cannot be settled by any Return laid upon the Table of the House. The margin left by the rule, the difference between twenty and twenty-three days, exists in order that the general condition of business may be taken into account.

The Vote of Censure.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I wish to ask a point of business which is not perhaps unfamiliar to the Prime Minister, whether he will now, after the fortnight's delay which was not unreasonably claimed, name a day for the Motion standing in the name of my right hon. friend the Member for Berwick.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The delay has been a good deal more than a fortnight——

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman said it could not be any day within the next fortnight, and that fortnight is drawing to its close.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is the last instalment of delay. But without going into that, I shall be delighted to give the right hon. Gentleman the earliest opportunity at my disposal, and I propose, therefore, that the vote of censure shall be taken on Monday.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: What will be the business on Tuesday and Wednesday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Irish Supply will be taken on Tuesday, if that suits hon. Gentlemen opposite. As regards Wednesday, there have been negotiations with regard both to the Unemployed Bill and the Naval Works Bill. If the Second Reading of the Naval Works Bill is taken next Friday, I shall propose to take the Unemployed Bill on Wednesday. We have to get the Report of the Resolutions on the Naval Works Bill, and not till then can the Bill be printed, so that it cannot be in the hands of hon. Members till Friday morning. But the Bill deals with general principles, there is no new item in it, and I think all the information desired will probably be found in the Bill of last year. My hon. friend the Civil Lord of the Admiralty will make a statement as to the Bill in order to facilitate matters, and I hope that, notice having been given, there will be no objection to the Bill being taken on Friday on the ground that it has been so short a time in the hands of Members.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The right hon. Gentleman has promised me Wednesday evening for the discussion on the Report of the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, and as at present advised I propose to adhere to that arrangement.

MR. BROADHURST: Could we not get copies of the Naval Works Bill to-morrow night.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, that is impossible.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): If the Committee on the Scottish Churches Bill finishes to-night when will the next stage be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should like to take the Report stage of the Churches (Scotland) Bill soon, but I cannot promise a particular day at present.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Frederick William Chance, esquire, for the Borough of Carlisle.

POLICE AND SANITARY COMMITTEE.

Special Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 247.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 247.]

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) (No. 1) BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 279.]

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 280.]

NATIONAL MONUMENTS IN CHURCHES.

SIR ELLIOTT LEES (Birkenhead) asked for leave to introduce, under the ten minutes rule, a "Bill to prevent the removal without Parliamentary sanction of monuments which have been erected in cathedrals or churches out of public moneys in pursuance of a vote by Parliament." He said the Bill provided that any such proposal should lie on the Table of the House for forty days in order to give the House an opportunity of expressing disapproval if it so desired, and his object in introducing the Bill at that moment was to call the attention of the House before it was too late to a proposal of the Dean of Westminster, who had under his complete control the Abbey and all it contained, subject only to the Crown, to remove a monument erected by Parliament out of public funds, in the middle of the 18th century, to the memory of a gallant sailor, Captain Cornewall, who was killed at the battle of Toulon. Only some parts of the monument, the inscription and the medallions, were to be preserved, and they were to be placed high up in a very dark corner of the Abbey. In the place of the Cornewall monument a screen was to be erected, and behind it was to be placed a recumbent effigy of the late Lord Salisbury. A very delicate question was raised by this proposal of the Dean of Westminster. He yielded to no one in his veneration of the character and career of the late Lord Salisbury, whom he regarded as the greatest Englishman of his own time. He hoped it was possible to honour the memory of that great statesman without in any way slighting the memory of a bygone hero, and he thought the memory of a patriotic statesman could be more fittingly perpetuated than by the destruction of the monument to a patriotic sailor who died a splendid death for his country. He did not, however, desire to force upon the House the invidious task of voting for or against the proposal of the Dean of Westminster. His object was to ensure that monuments erected by Parliament to the memory of men who had deserved well of their country should not in future be removed; and therefore he would so frame his Bill that it should not come into operation until January 1st, 1906.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to prevent the removal, without Parliamentary sanction, of Monuments which have been erected in Cathedrals or Churches out of Public Moneys in pursuance of a Vote by Parliament."—(*Sir Elliott Lees.*)

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY, (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am sorry I did not know that my hon. friend was going to bring in this Bill, and I desire to say but a few words which occur to me on the spur of the moment. I gather that the terms of the Bill are so framed that they do not touch the case which has occupied the whole of my hon. friend's speech—namely, the proposal of the Dean of Westminster with regard to the statue voted by the House to the late Lord Salisbury. The Dean of Westminster has come to the conclusion—a conclusion which I, at all events, share—that the north transept of the Abbey is now so crowded, if not overcrowded, with the statues of eminent statesmen which have been voted by this House, that to add the proposed statue to the late Lord Salisbury to the effigies already assembled there, Gladstone, Disraeli, and Peel, is impossible from an architectural point of view. Indeed, such is the condition of things in the Abbey that a much more drastic Bill than the Bill of my hon. friend will have to be introduced—a Bill declaring that no money voted by the country shall go to the making of a full-sized statue of any statesman, soldier, or sailor, however distinguished his services or however great his career.

That being the state of things, the question arises, where is room to be found for the memorial which the House has voted to Lord Salisbury. My hon. friend objects to the site which has been chosen for it by the Dean and Chapter. I can only say, with regard to that, that I do not think any one can deny that it would greatly conduce to the beauty of the Abbey were that site chosen for the memorial and the plans of the Dean with regard to it carried into effect. The monument erected by Parliament to the memory of Captain Cornewall has already been altered by Dean Stanley. Pains were therefore taken to find out the opinions of the present rerepsentatives of Captain Cornewall's family, and of course there is no idea of excluding from the Abbey the monument to the memory of that gallant sailor. So far as I am able to offer an opinion on the subject, the suggestion of the Dean of Westminster appears to me to be a wise one in the interest of the architecture and beauty of the Abbey; but if it be objected to by public opinion, I venture to say, in the double capacity of Leader of the House and a near relative of the deceased statesman whom the House desires to honour, that, so far as the family at all events are concerned, there is no desire to see the statue to Lord Salisbury placed where the public do not desire to have it placed. But I am confident that if anyone will examine the facts for himself he will come to the conclusion that in this matter the Dean is right. The Bill of my hon. friend, however, does not apply to this particular case, and I therefore regret that he should have made his speech a hostile commentary and criticism upon the conduct of the Dean.

Sir ELLIOTT LEES said that, as a matter of personal explanation, he desired to say that nothing could be further from his mind than to show discourtesy to his right hon. friend and leader. He had asked the Speaker whether he could put a Question to the Prime Minister on the subject, and it was in consequence of the ruling of the Speaker that he was precluded from asking a Question, and at the Speaker's suggestion as to the procedure of the House that he had raised the matter by means of bringing in a Bill.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I think in this case I should exercise the discretion vested in me by Standing Order No. 11. The hon. Gentleman says he does not propose that the Bill should take effect until January 1st, 1907. Therefore there is no pressing necessity for going on with it. I propose, therefore, to put the Question that the debate be now adjourned.

Question, "That the debate be now adjourned," put, and agreed to.

NAVAL WORKS [CONSOLIDATED FUND].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to make further provision for the construction of works in the United Kingdom and elsewhere for the purposes of the Royal Navy, and to authorise the issue, out of the Consolidated Fund, of such sums, not exceeding £5,835,000, as may be required for those purposes, and to make provision for raising in the manner provided by Section 5 of The Naval Works Act, 1895, the sums so issued by Terminable Annuities for a period not exceeding thirty years from the dates of the borrowing."—(*Mr. Arthur Lee.*)

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said he proposed to address a number of Questions to the Civil Lord of the Admiralty with a view to securing information which would enable them the better to discuss this Bill on the Motion for its Second Reading. The measure had been brought in very late in the session, and he would once more like to impress on the Government the desirability of enabling the Navy Estimates to be debated with a full knowledge of the proposed naval expenditure for the year. He also thought that the Resolution which was proposed on an occasion like this should be printed on the orders of the day. He trusted that this was to be the last Naval Works Bill. He desired to know what was the amount to be expended at Rosyth and on the Chatham Dockyard extension and also how much was to be set apart for the coastguard stations. He wished also to get at the entire committal of the country under the Naval Works Loan Bill, and to be informed whether there had been or was to be any variation in the concluding estimates. He saw the Government were asking for £5,800,000 under this Bill, and he desired to know how that was to be apportioned between the next two years. Finally, could the hon. Gentleman hold out any hope that this method of procedure by loan would be departed from and items be transferred from the schedule of this Bill to Vote 10 of the Navy Estimates ?

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARTHUR LEE, Hampshire, Fareham), said the list of items in the new Bill was closed, although it was not contended that there might not be small variations in the total estimates as given in the 1903 Bill. As to the Question whether the system of token sums which appeared in the 1903 Bill would now be brought to an end, the Answer was in the affirmative. There were no token sums in the Bill of this year, and the total estimates were given for the particular items which were shown under token sums in 1903. No doubt there were objections to the system of token sums; at the same time it was inevitable in 1903, when the details of the large schemes which were in progress had not been thoroughly worked out. The definite items then shown by token sums were Rosyth, the Chatham extension, and the coastguard stations. The total estimate for Rosyth, which was not the total estimate for all time, but the estimate for the present scheme of the Board of Admiralty, was £2,500,000. The whole of that amount was not inserted in the present Loan Bill, for a reason which he would shortly explain, but it was the total to which the Admiralty wished to commit the House of Commons as regards Rosyth. That included £200,000 already voted for preliminary works. With regard to Chatham, the total estimate was £70,000, including preliminary works already accomplished. There was a large question as to the relative advantages of Chatham and Rosyth which he should be glad to develop in the debate on the Second Reading on Friday. As to the coastguard, hon. Members had been led to expect the total estimate would be over £500,000, but the actual total estimate to which the Board of Admiralty now wished to commit the House was only £200,000. There would necessarily be some variation in the total estimates in respect of other items, because it was impossible to foresee two years beforehand exactly what expenditure would be incurred in the progress of the various works. There were a number of items in which the total estimates had been reduced, and others in which they had been exceeded.

The hon. Member had asked what was the total expenditure to be asked for in the Bill in the current year. The total expenditure was £32,206,000, and that was only an increase of £566,000 on the Bill of 1903. The expenditure for the next two years, for the period of the 1905 Bill, was estimated at £7,704,000, but of that amount £1,869,000 was already in hand unexpended, so that £5,835,000 was the total asked for in the Resolution. He was asked how much of this total of £7,704,000 would be expended in each of the two succeeding years. He could not give the exact amounts, because it would obviously depend upon the progress of the works. Approximately it would be half in each year. Lastly, the hon. Member appealed to the Government as to whether they would be willing to bring the system of Loan Bills to an end at the earliest opportunity. He could assure him and the Committee that it was the desire and intention of the Government to close up this system at the earliest opportunity, and to bring any additional expenditure which might be necessary either in connection with works mentioned in the Bill, or works which might possibly be required in the future, as far as possible on the ordinary naval Vote, or, in other words, Vote 10. That policy would to a certain extent be followed with regard to certain items in the new Bill. Certain items, or the remaining portions of expenditure on certain items, would be transferred from loan to Votes, and in that way the policy so urgently desired by the hon. Gentleman and the Committee generally would be initiated. He thought he had now answered all the Questions.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said the right hon. Gentleman had indicated the nature of the Vote when he told them that His Majesty's Government wished to commit the House. It was indeed a committal. If the House granted this, it would authorise the expenditure of £5,800,000, and would completely part with all control over it. It was true the House would get accounts year by year, but it would not be able to prevent the expenditure of a single farthing of the money authorised by the Naval Works Loan Bill. It was quite true that in order to get in that position they had to pass the Bill, but this was the Resolution on which the Bill must be founded. They were now discussing an entirely different thing to what they would discuss on the Bill. They were now discussing whether on the whole it was expedient to authorise the provision of this £5,800,000 for the purposes named. When once the Resolution was passed and the issue was authorised, then they came to the Bill which said what was to be done with it. He was dealing with the question as it stood before them at present, whether it was expedient to authorise provision to the extent of £5,800,000 by way of naval works loan in order to provide for naval works, and he would distinctly say it was not expedient to make that provision. The country was already liable for works loans—naval, military, and civil—of no less than £41,664,000, and they were now to add £5,800,000, nearly £6,000,000. They must, in considering their present position with regard to naval and other loans, ask whether they were warranted in adding debt to debt. Their liability on March 31st, 1905, for naval works was £16,000,000 out of total liabilities of £41,000,000. That was an increase of £5,000,000 over the preceding year, and they were now asked to add another £5,800,000, so that the total naval liability would be at least £22,000,000. He could not help thinking whether the Committee ought to warrant that enormous increase of our national liability without considering what that national liability was.

He would cite a few eloquent figures. The total funded debt, unfunded debt, terminable annuities, capital liabilities (of which this would be a part), guaranteed loans, and contingent liabilities amounted altogether to £738,000,000 in 1894, to £948,800,000 in 1904, and they now amounted to £973,000,000. Of course, he had not taken into account the liabilities of local authorities. Since 1894 the national liabilities, which he admitted were not all of the same character, but all of which might some day come upon them, had been increased by nearly one third, and they were now asked to increase them further by something like £5,800,000. He very much doubted, and always had doubted, the wisdom of this brick-and-mortar policy on the part of the Admiralty. His opinion was that the Admiralty ought to restrict itself to its proper sphere, the sea, and providing ships. It seemed to him to have failed in its misguided brick-and-mortar ambitions. He had seen that day a telegram in the paper which said that already Gibraltar had proved insufficient for the repairs required of it. He did not wonder at it; he always said it would be insufficient. There was, however, another point. If there had been a lesson which the present war had taught us, it was that it was not to arsenals ashore that we should look for repairs and the keeping up of our ships, but either to giving facilities of repairs to the ship herself in her own inside or by accompanying the Fleet with repairing vessels as the Japanese had done with such success that for two years their ships were kept going by their repairing ships and never had to go for repairs to an arsenal, although they had been fighting all the time. That was a very serious fact. It suggested the uselessness in time of war of our great arsenals and of the Admiralty's brick-and-mortar arrangements, and that their efforts should have been in another direction, that of giving their ships the power of making castings and making repairs themselves to a large extent; or of accompanying the Fleet, as the Japanese had done, with repairing ships.

Assuming, however, for the sake of argument, that £5,800,000 was required for the Admiralty's brick-and-mortar policy, this was not the form in which it should come before them, nor should it be suggested that they should raise it by loan. It should appear in the Estimates. The Public Accounts Committee had made every effort to get items removed from the naval works loan into the Estimates, but the effort of the Admiralty was quite the contrary. Only recently it had turned out that they were constantly endeavouring to take items off the Estimates and put them on the loans account. If they wanted this £5,800,000, let them put it on the Estimates. Then the House would have control over the expenditure. Once let them authorise the sum and pass the Loans Bill which specified what was to be done with it, and the House had no control left over it whatever. That was the great vice of the naval works loan system. The right hon. Gentleman said they were going to stop it. Yes, but after they had been indulging in it for ten years, and raising loans of £40,000,000, they were going to stop it in order to prevent hon. Gentlemen opposite having that opportunity of spending money of which the present Government had so largely availed itself. He did not think that was fair. If the policy were a sound one, it was not now, on the death-bed of the Government, that they should give it up; they should hand it over intact to their successors. It was because they did not believe in it that they were giving it up, and he did not believe in it. It was unsound; it deprived the House of financial control; and it led to extravagance and carelessness on the part of the Admiralty. It was altogether a bad policy. But if it were a bad policy to raise money for naval expenditure by way of loan instead of putting it on the Estimates—and he was convinced it was—now, and now alone, was the time to stop it: now was the time to put the gag on their naval expenditure, on this Resolution and not on the Bill. Was the Committee prepared to authorise an addition of £5,800,000 to this bad, wicked, and mischievous system of naval loans? In other words, was the Committee conscious of the great need for economy, and, above all, for the reduction of debt? If it was, it would call a halt. For his own part he would do nothing towards taking the first step in adding £5,800,000 to the Debt, and when the division was taken he would deem it his duty, in the interests of economy, to vote against the proposal.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E) thought it would be much better to have the discussion on the Second Reading of the Bill after the House had had an opportunity of considering the items involved. Considerable alterations had been made from the Bill of two years ago, and their effect could not be properly appreciated unless such an arrangement as he suggested were made. He doubted whether the Committee was aware of the great importance and the novel character of the large items in the Bill. There were a considerable number of them, into which from year to year charges of some magnitude were put, and paid for out of loan money. That was an important variation from previous Bills, and it was only by an inspection of the present measure that it could be seen whether a stop had been put to the practice. The Civil Lord had stated most frankly that the £2,500,000 put down for Rosyth did not represent the total estimated cost.

*Mr. ARTHUR LEE said the hon. Member had misunderstood him. The total estimated cost of the scheme for Rosyth was £2,500,000. What he said was that the present Government could not bind their successors, who might wish to spend more money; but so far as the present Board was concerned £2,500,000 was the total estimated cost.

Mr. BUCHANAN, passing from Rosyth, said the statement of the hon. Gentleman with regard to the Chatham Dockyard extension meant the abandonment of the work, which was the main feature of the 1903 Bill, and a most important factor in our naval works policy. There was another important point. The total cost came out at £32,206,000, which was an increase of a little over £500,000. Consequently, seeing there was an increase of £2,500,000 on the one item of Rosyth, there must have been considerable reductions in other items. In view of these facts it was impossible to judge of the general principle underlying the policy embodied in the Bill, or adequately to criticise the particular items in the schedule, until they had had an opportunity of examining the Bill.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): said that on this occasion he proposed to support the hon. Member for King's Lynn. Upon some of the items of the Bill his views differed entirely from those of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, but the question raised by the hon. Member on this occasion was not the particular items in the Bill, but whether the time had not come when this system of loans should be abandoned in favour of bearing these charges on the Votes. Two facts most material to that issue had considerably changed his opinion, as they had the opinion of many others within the last few years on this subject. One was that the Government of India, after the fullest consideration, had come to the conclusion that the system could not be justified in the case of India, where loans had been more resorted to than in this country, and they had placed on the Estimates the whole of the expenditure required by the Kitchener redistribution scheme. The other fact, pointing in the same direction, was that within the last year we had had a revelation of the extraordinary extent to which, by a loan system, the country might be committed to expenditure which, in a few years, by a reversal of policy, might be shown to be not only unnecessary but actually wasteful. In St. Lucia, Jamaica, Halifax, and a number of other places, money had been spent under Naval and Military Works Acts which were still running, and under which instalments of capital and interest were still being paid, and, owing to a change of policy, the country had been saddled with large expenditure which ought never to have been incurred at all. In view of these facts the case against the loan policy had been immensely strengthened, and as that was the question raised by the hon. Member for King's Lynn he should support him in the division.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) said he would not deal with the general question, though he might say that it was a little ungrateful to oppose the Resolution considering that his hon. friend had announced on the part of the Government the intention to abandon the loan system for the normal method of placing sums on the Votes. The situation which had justified the loan system had come to an end, and, therefore, the Government proposed to revert to the system of dealing with the annual needs of the Navy on the annual Estimates. But he would not enter upon the question of policy; he rose to reply to the Question of the hon. Member for Perthshire, who had asked him to reverse an arrangement arrived at earlier as to the course of business. It would be very inconvenient to make that alteration after he had done his best to meet the wishes of Members interested in the Unemployed Bill, and who had gone away justified in the belief that that Bill would not be taken on Friday, and that the Naval Works Bill would be taken on that day. Nothing that had since passed appeared to justify the change, and the Naval Works Bill ought to meet the wishes of the critics of the system. There were one or two questions of interest to be discussed, but they would not require any lengthened study of the Bill, and he hoped the arrangement for Friday, arrived at by common consent, would not be interfered with.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked whether the schedule could be circulated apart from the Bill itself.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that if it were in accordance with precedent he would be glad to see if that could be done.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: It need not be called the schedule of the Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he would be very glad to meet the views of the hon. Gentleman on that point. He understood that it would go to the printers that afternoon, and no exertions would be wanting on the part of the Admiralty to ensure its being in the hands of Members at the earliest opportunity.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he should vote with the hon. Member for King's Lynn on the ground that it had been made abundantly clear that these works loans had led to a large amount of expenditure which in a short time was shown to have been not only unnecessary but positively wasteful. There was also another ground on which he should vote against the present proposal. The Prime Minister had stated that it was not the intention of the Government to include any more of these loans in Works Bills, but that the burden would be placed on the ordinary Navy Estimates. That was a policy which he and many others on that side of the House had advocated for many years, and it was hardly satisfactory that the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues should at the eleventh hour make such a distinct change of policy and claim credit for having done it. He thought it was a wrong policy to continue these loan works which the Civil Lord of the Admiralty admitted were not going to be continued in the future. He had stated that next year they were going to transfer some of the smaller items such as the amounts for Rosyth and other places to the Estimate. If that was a right policy for the future it was right this year, and instead of asking for £6,000,000 in this way, some of the items ought to have been included in the Navy Estimates this year.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) regretted that the policy in regard to loans was not going to be reversed *in toto*. They were grateful for the statement which had been made upon this point by the Prime Minister, but he would remind the House that a similar statement was made in 1903 to the effect that this policy of loans would be abandoned, and that it was only adopted temporarily.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR dissented.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): I promised not to take any new item.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said the promise they had got now was the same as they got in 1903.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that strong objections were held against this loan policy, and he should vote for the proposal made by the hon. Member for King's Lynn.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR appealed to hon. Members to allow the division to be taken, because there would be a full opportunity of discussing this Bill at a later stage.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said the situation was worse than he expected, and he always took a gloomy view of Loan Bills. They had been led to expect some improvement and had been told that the way would be opened up for the House to escape from the situation they had got into. He was very glad that a distinct protest had been made by the hon. Member for King's Lynn. There was no necessity, in his opinion, for this Bill at all, because the Government admitted that they had nearly £2,000,000 in hand and that ought to be quite enough for the requirements of the year. He was glad that a division was to be taken and he should vote against the Resolution.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 219; Noes, 168. (Division List No. 297.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, RtHn.Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hon.SirH
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Baird, John George Alexander

Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex.H. (Shropshire
Brymer, William Ernest
Campbell, Rt. Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn. JA(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFred.Dixon
Dorington, Rt.Hn.SirJohnE.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, RtHn.AilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt.HnSirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Rt.Hn.SirRB(Inv'rn'ss
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Groves, James Grimble
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, SirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John H.
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.
Hickman, Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh,W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, RtHnSirHE.(Wigt'n.
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, JohnThrogmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott(Hants
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, SirH. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, RtHnJParker(Lanarks)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt.Hon.Lord (Lancs)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Rt. Hn. SirWilliamH
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wills, Sir Frederick (Bristol, N.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William, (Cork,N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, NE(York,NR,Whitby
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, CharlesRamsay(Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(S.AndrewsBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Findlay Alexander(Lanark,N.E
FitzMaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mooney, John J.
Morley, Rt. Hn. John(Montrose
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R.Threshie(Dumfries.
Richards, Thomas
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJT.(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Gibson Bowles.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

CHURCHES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 5:—

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) moved an Amendment to omit words requiring that the subscriptions to the Confession of Faith by persons appointed to chairs of theology in the Scottish Universities, and by the Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, shall be such as may be prescribed by Act of the General Assembly. Although Clause 5 was one of the most controversial character, he thought from the rapidity with which the Bill was dealt with yesterday that the particular Amendment which he now moved was not one which raised any Party issue, and it was one which he hoped might be discussed with perfect calmness and coolness. Indeed, he did not see why the Government should not accept the Amendment, and he ventured at least to hope that, even if they did not accept it, they would feel that it was a matter to be left to the judgment of the House, and not one which they should regard as a Party issue or in which they should endeavour to secure a particular determination of the House by employing the ordinary Party methods. Let him observe further that he had not gone out of his way to raise the question. It was a question which the Government had themselves raised by the provision in Clause 5 relating to the theological chairs in the Scottish Universities. That was a matter outside the general scope of the Bill, but it was impossible for them to ignore it, and he was obliged to move the Amendment because he hoped to show the Committee that if he did not do so they would allow a novel, and in some respects a revolutionary, change to be effected in the position of the Scottish Universities.

The history of the Scottish University tests was a very long history. When the Universities of Scotland were dealt with at the Revolution Settlement they were not dealt with along with the question of the subscription to be made by ministers of the Church. The Universities were separately dealt with in 1690 by a separate statute. They were not included in the Act of 1690, nor in the Act of 1693, to which the Lord-Advocate had so often referred. They were again dealt with separately in 1707, and he wished to call the particular attention of the Committee to this fact, that whereas the Act of 1693 placed the enforcement of the test in regard to ministers in the hands of the General Assembly, the Act of 1690 did not bring in the General Assembly, but created a special Commission consisting of ministers, barons, Judges, and other persons, mainly laymen. The whole matter came up in the year 1889 when a Bill dealing with the Scottish Universities was passed. That Bill was introduced by the Conservative Government, and on that occasion he moved an Amendment directing the Commission, which was to be appointed under the Bill, to abolish tests and to open all the theological chairs to all comers. They were then the only chairs which remained subject to tests. The Conservative Government of the day met the proposal, not by denying the expediency of opening the chairs—they did not resist the proposal on its merits—but they proposed that it should be referred to the Parliamentary Commission which was appointed by the Bill to take evidence and to report on the question of what should be done in the case of the theological faculties. They had a long debate in which the present First Lord of the Treasury and the late Mr. Gladstone took part, and the result of that discussion was that the Amendment was rejected and it was referred to a Parliamentary Commission to investigate the matter and to report what should be done in regard to these chairs.

The Commission took very full and important evidence and issued a very elaborate Report in the year 1892. If hon. Members referred to that Report they would find that few Reports dealt in a more fair manner with the relations which ought to subsist between the Universities and the national life and education of any country. In particular he would refer to the evidence of Principal Caird, who, as everybody knew, was one of the brightest ornaments of the Church to which he belonged and of Scottish theology. Principal Caird was in favour of the abolition of these tests so as to throw open those chairs to all Scottish Presbyterians. Professor Story, now Principal Story of Glasgow University, approved of the abolition of the tests; and Principal Cunninghame, of St. Andrews, also approved of the abolition of the tests. He did not think that they could have three names belonging to the Established Church more representative or more entitled to weight in this House than these distinguished gentlemen. The Commission itself, by a majority, reported in favour of the abolition of the tests. The Commission consisted of a number of eminent and distinguished men—Lord Kinnear, Chairman of the Commission, Lord Elgin, Mr. Macintosh, now Lord Kyllachry, the hon. Baronet the Member for Ipswich, Sir Arthur Mitchell, Mr. Crawford, Dr. Blackie, and Mr. Butcher, who was then professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. The Committee would be good enough to observe that five of these gentlemen—he was not sure if it was not even more than five—were members of the Conservative Party, and therefore the Commission had not a political character. These five gentlemen held Conservative principles, and they did not think that there was anything in these principles against the Report which they made.

The Commission made use of the argument with which they were all familiar which showed that these tests were unfortunate. They pointed out that the tests created the impression that a theological professor could not be in a position of an independent inquirer; that tests pressed most severely and harshly on men of tender consciences, while they were no obstacle to those whose consciences were hard. They said that tests were of no value to the community; that they never ensured orthodoxy; and they added the material consideration that if they were to prevent students in the Universities from hearing opinions which might affect their theological views, they must not confine themselves to theological tests. They must impose tests on the occupants of such chairs as moral philosophy and natural science which existed at one time. Such tests had been abandoned in these latter faculties, and they were now perfectly free. How absurd it was to say that a man might be safely entrusted to hear teaching on ethics which might be opposed to the views of current theology, and that he was not to hear the views of theological professors, especially considering that all students preparing for the Scotch ministry must attend the arts course before approaching their theological study. The Commission added also that the tests excluded a large number of distinguished men, whom tests ought not to exclude, men belonging to the other Presbyterian bodies who would be eminently fitted to adorn the chairs of theology in the Scottish Universities. He would refer to two sentences in the Report which he thought of great importance. In one place the Commission said—

> "We agree with the opinion that the proper test for a professor is to be found in the functions to which the professor is called; his acknowledged fitness for the place, and that the character and conscience of the man afford the only proof and security for the faithful performance of his duty."

The Commission also said that—

> "We are of opinion that theological professors, like the professors in other faculties, ought to be relieved from the obligation to suscribe to any religious or ecclesiastical formula."

The tribunal which the Government had invoked at that time had given its opinion, and it was fairly reasonable that the opinion so delivered should have the respect and confidence of this House. Surely the experience they had had of theological tests in many Universities, and under many conditions, established the doctrine that it was only freedom that was of any use for those who were set to teach. How could they say to a man—"Investigate the truth, study the Scriptures; study Ecclesiastical history, examine Biblical criticism, go to every source from which you can get light on ecclesiastical history and theological truth, but, whatever your investigation may be, remember you must come to only one conclusion." How could they say that to an investigator, or expect that the teaching the professor gave could have the confidence of the students and produce the impression that it ought to have on them, when he was bound, beforehand, to arrive at only one conclusion? That argument applied to any test whatever, but it would apply especially to any new test.

He dared say that if the power was given to impose a new test, it would be somewhat less stringent in its terms than the present test; but it would have to go very far indeed if it was to meet all the sentiment and conscience of our times. Many large questions had been raised which were not so frequently raised in earlier times, and he thought it would be hard to apply any test now-a-days which would not exclude men of tender conscience who would be perfectly willing because they had not come to any adverse conclusion to give consideration on lines which were in general conformity with orthodoxy, but who would hesitate to subscribe to the propositions contained in the test itself. Those who had watched the current of theological thought knew that many new questions of this kind had arisen. And it must be remembered that a new test would be, of necessity, construed more strictly than an old test, with a more careful regard to every word and without any of that easy-going spirit in which old tests were regarded. He remembered that the late Mr. Jowett said that "Old fetters gall less than new ones." Of course that was true. A new test would be more severe than a test that had been worn down by the attrition of centuries. He knew that there was every reason to suppose that, if a new test were imposed, that new test would probably be much more lax than the old one. There was, however, no security for that. If they were to follow the current that now ran they might expect the test to be easier than the subscription to the Confession of Faith was at this moment; but in ecclesiastical and religious matters there were times when the current ran towards stringency, as well as tides which ran towards laxity. They had seen revivals of that kind in other countries, and it could not be said that it was not possible that thirty, forty, or fifty years hence—he did not say through the whole Christian world—but that in particular Churches the current might run in a different direction, and that there might be a disposition on the part of the dominant party to impose a severer test than existed at the present time. They were asked to impose a legislative test, not for the present time, but for all future time. Therefore, they must carry their minds beyond the conditions of the moment in estimating the results of their present action.

There was another objection. The decision of 1889, by the test then imposed, had the effect of sectarianising what ought to be a national institution. Their Universities were the pride of the whole people of Scotland, and the effect of that test was to narrow them. Now it was proposed by this Bill to take the test and formula of the subscription out of the hands of the State and away from the Legislature and to give it to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Surely that was giving it over to one particular denomination, whereas it was now in the hands of the nation. He could not conceive anything which was more calculated to denationalise the Universities of Scotland than to remove them from the position which they now held under the control of Parliament alone. In 1690 this power was not given over to the General Assembly, but given to a special commission consisting largely of laymen, and he would call attention to the fact that under the present law it was not the General Assemby that had the power to impose a test. It was the University in Court, subject to appeal to His Majesty in Council. It was not necessary that the holders of theological chairs should be bound beforehand to certain theological views. It had not been found necessary in other countries. The proper security was to leave the selection of professors to the electors, which was all the difference in the world from imposing a test and excluding everyone who did not belong to that particular body. There were other countries in which it was left to the electors. In the Universities of Germany and Holland there were no theological tests. Hon. Members would say that the Universities of Germany and Holland did not conform to the same standard of orthodoxy which was observed and desired by some people in this country; but he was told that a very large proportion of the students in the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland went to them. And it was not confined to Germany and Holland; it was the case in the United States also. He could give some instances. One was a very remarkable case, because the theological tests which existed were abolished two months ago by the governing body of the college in New York. All these things were considered by the Commissioners, and they came to the conclusion that it was quite sufficient for the purpose of keeping the Universities in harmony with the religious thought in Scotland to trust to the appointing authorities, those authorities being in some cases the Crown and in others the Courts. The upshot of the view of the Commissioners was summed up by the late Principal Caird, a man most generally respected for his abilities and character, when he said he was willing to leave the matter to the power of Christian truth and to the discretion of Christian men.

Another objection that might be taken was that the Churches themselves would object. He believed that was not true. There might be some ministers and some of the laity of the Established Church who would object, but he was perfectly sure that the great majority desired it. There were many who desired a change in 1902, and he was sure great progress had been made since then. If he were asked whether the change would injure the Established Church, Scotland, or theology, he would unhesitatingly answer "No." He believed it would benefit them all, for it would immensely increase the area of choice. There was an eminent professor who died a few years ago, the late Dr. A. B. Davidson, and he did not suppose there was anybody who did so much for theological learning as he did; but he was a professor of the Free Church, and could not be a professor of the University, although, he believed, even in the Established Church there would have been a unanimous wish that he should have been, because it was felt that he was at the head of theological learning in Scotland. He believed there would be a further great benefit in the change proposed in the fact that it would bring together the students of the different Churches during their years of study. It would accustom them to know one another, and it would tend to diminish and reduce whatever little jealousy there might be. English Members, he was sure, realised how entirely at one was the theology of Scotland. Neither in doctrine, discipline, or ritual were there any differences which separated the Churches of Scotland. It was desirable, therefore, that the students of these various Churches should associate together in their student years. They were in the habit of forming aspirations for union of the Churches. No one expressed them more sincerely than the First Lord of the Treasury. Here they had an opportunity of taking a tangible step towards the union of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland—a step which he believed was generally approved, and if they were sincere in those aspirations for the unity of the Presbyterian Churches, let them take the step when the opportunity offered.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 20, to leave out from the word 'established,' to the word 'shall,' in line 22.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): There are many observations scattered through the interesting speech to which we have just listened with which I am in hearty agreement, but there are one or two matters which the right hon. Gentleman has brought before us and one or two arguments and one or two general views from which I very profoundly dissent. Nor do I think that he has made it quite clear, even to himself, exactly what it is he wants. The last part of his speech was aimed at a policy which should make the theological chairs of the Scottish Universities equally available to all Presbyterian Churches.

MR. BRYCE: No. I desire to abolish all tests. I desire what was recommended by the Royal Commission—the abolition of all tests.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The last observation of the right hon. Gentleman was that the incidental result of his proposal—I put it in that way—was that the theological chairs of Scotland would be equally available and equally useful to all the Presbyterian Churches. I desire, I should desire, that the theological chairs in the Scottish Universities should be equally useful to all the Presbyterian Churches, but I do not think it would be obtained by the path which the right hon. Gentleman desires us to pursue. I think the result of carrying out his policy would be to prevent the theological chairs from being useful to the Established Church of Scotland, but not to make them useful to the other Presbyterian Churches of Scotland. And why does the right hon. Gentleman take the opposite view? He takes it partly upon general grounds, to which I shall advert presently, but partly on what he describes as the authority of the Commission appointed in 1889. Now I am bound to tell the Committee that, in my judgment, the right hon. Gentleman has totally misapprehended the purport of that document, and when he described, as he has described over and over again, the opinion of the majority of the Commission as recommending the total abolition of tests, and nothing more, he, unwittingly no doubt, but most completely, misrepresented the view of the body whose opinion he quoted. What he quoted was accurately quoted, but he forgot to mention to the Committee that the Report, not once, nor twice, but many times in its course, clearly laid down that if you are going to abolish tests, you would have to set up a body for appointing these professors, which would be the equivalent of a test, and which, in other words, would only appoint persons who held the theological opinions that, in its judgment, would make them useful teachers of those who were preparing for the work of the ministry in the Presbyterian Church.

Mr. BRYCE said he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that he did not think he had taken an incorrect view of the Report. The Commission suggested that, if necessary, other representatives might be added to the appointment board, but they recommended the abolition of tests in an unqualified way, and he did not think that the part to which the right hon. Gentleman referred was an essential portion of their proposal. For his part, he had intimated himself that if it was desired to add to the appointment authority there was no objection to that. Therefore he believed he was in accord with the recommendation of the Commission.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am quite certain that the right hon. Gentleman is not in accord. If he will look at page 28 of the Report and the last paragraph but one, it runs as follows—

> "That the evidence appears to us to establish that the Churches are not likely to give their confidence to an untested theological faculty unless they have themselves a voice in the selection of the professors, and we are, therefore, of opinion that in any abolition of tests provision should at the same time be made for the constitution of boards of curators, on which the Churches may be represented."

Mr. BRYCE: There is no objection to that.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: All the Churches are Presbyterian Churches. Does the right hon. Gentleman deny that? One other extract. The Commissioners then discuss the kind of board it ought to be. It is to consist of four members. What are the four members to be? The Commission propose that the appointment body should consist of four members, to be appointed by the University Court. One of these four members is to be a member of the Faculty of Divinity; the other three are to be representatives of the Presbyterian Churches, one to be appointed by each. A little lower down is the sentence—

> "What we think essential for the purposes we have explained is that a special board shall be constituted, including the representative of the University Court and of the Presbyterian Churches and of such of these Churches as may desire to have a voice in the appointment of the professors."

I could multiply the quotations, but the policy of the Commissioners is perfectly obvious from the quotations I have made. They did desire to abolish tests, but they desired to substitute for formal subscription to any creed or formula a careful selection by persons belonging to the Presbyterian Churches in order that the confidence of those Churches might be secured in the persons of those who were to teach the future ministers of the Church. I do not believe that that can be attained unless you retain tests in some form, and, I hope, a modified form, as the Bill proposes, or unless you have such a body as that which I have spoken of.

Mr. BRYCE: I would ask the Committee to bear in mind that they must read the whole of this Report if they are to arrive at a just estimate of what the Commission mean.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman's interruptions are so much longer than my speech that I do not know that I shall easily get to the end of it, though I listened with great silence and respect to the right hon. Gentleman. He now says that nobody can understand this Report unless he reads the whole of it, but he did not read the whole of it. He read misleading extracts from it, and it is to correct the extraordinarily misleading effect he produced that I am obliged to read others. The other sentence which he has quoted against me really confirms what I have said. It is exactly on all fours with the quotations which I have read, which indicate that the policy of this Commission was that tests should be removed, and that, in place of tests, we should take care that the views of the Presbyterian Churches, not Christians at large, still less religious persons at large, should be secured, for the very obvious reason that it was to the professors so selected that the education of the ministers was to be granted. I think that is undeniable. I do not deny that I have great sympathy with that part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech in which he pleaded for an absolutely unfettered school of theology. He quoted an American precedent, in which he said there was a school of theology absolutely unfettered, and in a moment of carelessness he said that all that was required of a professor there was that he was to be a Christian, though he corrected that immediately afterwards, and told us what was undoubtedly the fact—that there is no limitation in the particular educational institution to which he referred on the religious belief of the professors. I, for my part, think that such an absolutely unlimited school of theology might be extremely useful. I do not deny that. But then, probably, they would not be very desirable schools from the point of view of teaching young ministers for a particular Church.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Because I can quite imagine cases—and it would not be difficult to quote names—in which those who had contributed very largely both to the comparative history of all religions and to the actual discipline and development of the Christian religion, themselves believed in no religion at all. That absolutely unlimited and dispassionate consideration of religion is a mere phenomenon among other phenomena to be looked at from the outside, and to be regarded as one of the products of civilised humanity. I do not deny that that may be a very instructive subject of scientific investigation, but I do say that when your object is to educate those who desire to work in the ministry of a particular Church, you might have very curious results if that was one of the stages of education through which it was necessary for them to go. Whether it be a right or a wrong view, is it not the view of every Church? That is the point. It is not necessary for us to determine here whether this purely dispassionate, external, and scientific view of religion is the one on which a University chair may best be occupied or not. We need not determine that question. What we have to determine is whether, when the Church desires that there should be a school in which its ministry may be educated, it should not be allowed to make such arrangements as should give it confidence that the religion taught should be such as they desire. Of course, every Presbyterian Church in Scotland, when it comes to a practical issue, would agree with what I am saying. Have other chairs, if you like, to deal with the comparative history of all religions, or any other subject absolutely unconnected with Christianity, with one Christian Church rather than another, or with Christianity rather than Buddhism or Mohammedanism, or any other of the great religions which have influenced mankind, but do not mix that up with the other problem, which is that of providing education for a large body of the best of our young countrymen who desire to serve one or other of the great religious interests in one or other of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland.

I hope, in the first place, we shall not by any Amendment to this Bill drag in this question of the reorganisation of the Universities, and I hope, in the second place, that we shall not prevent the relaxation of the test which the clause allows for professors. We are all agreed, I think, about the second proposition. It may not go far enough, but in the direction it goes every one is agreed. As regards the first, personally I think that this is not a very convenient time to deal with the reorganisation of University education. May I remind the right hon. Gentleman that I and my friends have been attacked for introducing Clause 5 at all, but to extend that clause from its present comparatively modest limits, so as to deal with the whole question of University tests in Scotland, would be really to give an extension to our discussions which would be deplorable on every ground, religious, educational, and academic.

Mr. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman will forgive me for reminding him that it was he, not I, who raised this question.

Mr. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) agreed that it was extremely desirable to see that the Churches had theological schools where they could train their students with some sense of security. But that was not the point. The Bill made a great change. It proposed to transfer the testing of the professors from the hands of the State, where it was now, and to place it under a particular Church, viz., the Established Church of Scotland. It proposed to transfer national, not sectarian, institutions from the control of the State to the control of a particular Church. That was the source of the feeling there was on the Opposition side of the House. The present test was old-fashioned, and had come to be regarded as a mere form, and people did not lay the same stress on it that they would on something that was comparatively new. What justification was there for what was now proposed to be done? They not only took away the test from the Government and put it into the hands of one of the Presbyterian Churches, but they put an obstacle in the way of the very thing they sought to accomplish—namely, to pave the way towards union among the Presbyterian Churches. If they made it more difficult for the students of the Free Church or the United Free Church to attend the lectures of the divinity professors, if the theological faculties of the Scottish Universities were to be faculties of one denomination, as they would be much more when this clause was passed than they were now, then certainly they would be putting a further obstacle in the way of Presbyterian reunion. He would like to see a state of things in which the students of each denomination would take their training where the best teaching was given.

It was true that the Report pointed out that the policy of tests by itself created a certain difficulty, but it went on to say that the difficulty could be got over in several ways, one being that the appointment of theological professors should not rest simply with the University Court or whatever was the appointing body at present, but should be under the control of a specially chosen body of curators. Such an arrangement could easily be made, possibly by Ordinance, and without coming to Parliament. But what the supporters of the present Amendment were asking for was that these national institutions, for such they were, should not cease to be national by being placed under the dominion of any one Church. In Scotland the course of studies for the arts faculty had been much enlarged. Hebrew was one of the subjects which might now be taken, and under this proposal it was to be taught by a professor tested by a particular denomination. That, surely, was a very retrograde step. He had got sympathy with the desire of the Government to set free the ministers of the Established Church from the test now imposed upon them in somewhat rigid terms, but he believed the matter had been somewhat hastily dealt with, and that the draftsman had found it easy to slip in the matter of the Universities. But this question of the Universities stood on an entirely different footing, and it was because they felt it was putting back the hands of the clock that the supporters of the Amendment desired to omit the words referred to. When even King's College had been abolishing its tests it was unfortunate that the Government should propose to put the test for the theological chairs in the Scotch Universities in the hands of a particular denomination, and he hoped it was not too late for one who was very friendly to the Bill to appeal to the Government to consider between now and the Report stage the grave question of principle here involved.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) entirely agreed with the proposer of the Amendment and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Haddingtonshire in their desire to get rid of the tests in theological chairs, and in their ideal that there should be one course of theological training for all theological students in Scotland. At present there was great overlapping, and an altogether unscientific distribution of theological chairs. That was put forward in the Report by no one more emphatically than Dr. Fairbairn, his idea being to weld the forces and the professorships in the colleges of the United Free Church and the Universities, and to make a single theological faculty in which the students of the different Churches should take part. That, however, could not be done by the present Bill. The right hon. Gentleman opposite seemed to have forgotten that besides the question of subscription there was the test requiring the professors to be members of the Church of Scotland. Even if the Amendment were carried that requirement would remain. That being so, was it unreasonable that the General Assembly should have the power of drawing up the words of subscription? It was not a fresh limitation. It was not putting under the General Assembly chairs which now might be held by non-members of the Church of Scotland. It simply continued that part of the qualification which consisted in the requirement that professors should be members of the Church of Scotland, but relaxed that part which consisted in subscribing verbal and literal adherence to the Confession, and put the professors in the same position as ministers would be, of subscribing a general adhesion to the standards of the Church.

He hoped the opportunity would be taken of reviving the movement for making one theological faculty in the different cities and Universities, and he believed the relaxation of the test would help the necessary negotiations between the Established and the Free Churches. What had to be done was to further the relaxation without rushing to such an extent that there might be a danger of the Churches declining to accept teaching without any test at all as a qualification for their students. Personally he did not believe in tests a bit. He agreed with the majority of the Commission that the professors should be chosen by a board containing members of the different Churches whose students were to be educated, who would consider it their duty not only to regard the scientific knowledge of candidates, but to look at them as men under whose charge future generations of ministers were to be trained. He hoped that would be the solution ultimately arrived at, and if he thought the Amendment would help forward such a solution he would support it. As, however, he did not think it would have that result, or that the problem could be satisfactorily dealt with in this Bill, he hoped the Government would adhere to the clause as it stood.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire) said he felt more in harmony with the Prime Minister than with the other speakers on this occasion. It seemed to him a reasonable thing that a Church in selecting the professors who would teach her ministers should require as much security from those professors as from the ministers themselves. As far as he could see, there was no distinction between doing away with tests for professors and taking a similar course with regard to ministers. Theological professors had much more to do with the doctrine afterwards taught than had the ministers themselves, because they practically formed the views of the students, and if the professors were Rationalists the whole ministry would probably become saturated with unbelief. For Scotland to get into the same condition as Germany in that respect would not make for advance. He did not advocate over-rigorous tests. He objected altogether to the extreme severity of the test now enacted in the Established Church, believing that it injured consciences and went beyond what they had a right to exact. But there was a great difference between requiring a man to subscribe to a thousand separate propositions, as was involved in the Confession of Faith, and saying that there should be absolutely no test at all. He believed that the Christian religion rested on a basis of solid truth. He did not desire to see human interpretations put too much to the front. In the past the Church had suffered from a far too minute and verbal theology, but he believed there were great fundamental truths at the foundation of the Christian religion, and unless a man believed those truths he was utterly unfit to be a minister of the Gospel. In every Church there must be some security that those who taught the future ministers believed those truths, and their belief must be in accordance with the main lines of Christian tradition. It was quite clear that there must be some guidance and direction in the matter and the whole thing must not be left to chance, or they would be preparing sad days for the Church of Scotland. So, balancing one thing against another, he was in favour of the clause as it now stood unless something better could be provided which would give more solid security in the future.

MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N.W.) thought the discussion must convince the Government of the very large question they had raised in this part of their Bill. He was bound to say that of all the remarkable parts of the Prime Minister's speech, perhaps the most remarkable part was that in which he complained that the subject introduced was not cognate with the Bill itself. It was not the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen who had introduced this topic and it was not his Amendment. The topic had been forced upon them by the Government, and, as a friend not only of this Bill but also of this special clause, he urged the Government to reconsider the step they were taking. He quite admitted what had been said by the Government and by the hon. Member for the Partick Division of Lanarkshire, that it was difficult within the limits of a Bill such as this to abolish tests because they had to provide some practical way of carrying on a school of theology which would ensure that it would not be left high and dry without pupils. That was an additional reason for not introducing so controversial a topic, raising and prejudicing as it inevitably did the whole question of tests and the way they were to be imposed.

He understood that the right hon. Member for Aberdeen did not wish to press his Amendment for the abolition of tests if the Government would agree not to prejudice the question of the imposition of tests by persisting in this part of the clause. There were many inconveniences in dealing with a question like the abolition of tests, and it was very difficult to deal with. He thought they had a right to insist that this question should not be prejudiced. He did not hesitate to say that this question was being prejudiced by this particular part of the clause, because it was a very much more serious matter to have a test authorised in a new Act of Parliament at this period. A new right was being given by this part of the Bill to the Church of Scotland which it had not hitherto enjoyed, which it was most inexpedient that it should have, and which would give it a claim to resist any improvement in the future towards making the occupancy of these chairs in Universities more open to all the men who were most competent to fill them. Surely it was not reasonable at this time of day to suggest that national institutions such as the Scottish Universities should be closely bound to any particular denomination, however much respected it might be, or whatever might be its hold upon the community. That was a sort of thing which ought not to be contemplated by any Government in this House. Many hon. Members on the opposite side sincerely sympathised with the desire to relax tests for professors of theology just as much as they desired to give all reasonable liberty to the Church of Scotland. Was it reasonable that a chair subsidised by this House should be made, so far as tests were concerned, the property of a single denomination. He hoped the Government would drop this part of the scheme.

*THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT-DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton) wished the Committee to note the position in which the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen placed them. He proposed to leave the Bill standing in so far as it was designed to deal with the test for ministers, but to take out of it the words making it apply to professors. The result would be that whereas they would have a relaxation of tests for ministers they would have no such relaxation for professors. He confessed he did not quite follow the position of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Haddington when he recalled his very recent observations, because he now said that the test was of no effect, because the Scottish professors taught theology of the widest description. That did not altogether meet the difficulty, because he remembered that on the last occasion on which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Haddington addressed the House on this matter he said something different. Speaking then upon University tests, he said—

> "We all know the test imposed upon Scottish professors. We all know it is a test to which hardly any honest man can subscribe his name. It is a test which implies all kinds of mental reservation and puts people in a position which certainly no one occupying the honourable and elevated position of professor of theology ought to be placed in."

With a great deal of that he agreed——

MR. HALDANE: I have seen so much since then of professors of theology in Scotland that I am convinced that I misjudged them. In the latitude and liberality of their view there is nothing to complain of.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said it was not the latitude and liberality of their view; it was the honesty. The right hon. Gentleman said it put men in a position which no one who occupied the honourable position of a professor ought to be placed in. There was a great deal of force in that view, and he thought there should be some relaxation. He could not understand the position where they were dealing, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Partick reminded them, with a class of professors who must be ministers of the Church for Scotland. If they took this out of the Bill, the result would be that they would have power to relax the formula for ministers of the Church and they would retain that rigid and severe form of subscription which the right Gentleman the Member for Haddington had referred to in the quotation he had read. If the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen was carried out and they had a scientific and non-religious faculty in the colleges—

MR. BRYCE: No; not non-religious.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: Then scientific, which need not be Christian.

MR. BRYCE: I said it was not to be subject to tests.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: Of course they might be Agnostic or Socinian or Buddhist or non-Christian. The result would be that if they had that kind of scientific teaching in the University the Established Church would set up its own form of schools and they would not have a school for the ministry of any of the Churches just for the very reasons that induced the United Presbyterian Church and the Free Church to set up their halls. Other students coudl attend there and there was no distinction between the theology of the Presbyterian Churches, which were all of the same character. He was confident that the Divinity students of the Established Church would go to their halls and they would find these faculties attended only by scientific students and not by those who intended to become practical ministers of the Church. He submitted to the House that the position suggested by this Amendment was not one which would conduce to harmony in Scotland, and by adopting it they would be taking the wrong step to bring about reorganisation. He urged the House to allow this relaxation to be applied not only to ministers but also to professors.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire) was entirely in favour of the relaxation of tests, and he was also in favour of the clause. His difficulty was that it was not a question of relaxation of tests but a question of transferring authority from the Universities to the Established Church. The Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen was intended to meet this difficulty and what the Amendment proposed was the course he would like to see taken. The Lord-Advocate had said that if they took out the words suggested they would leave a very inconvenient state of matters, because while ministers would have their test relaxed, professors would not. That would be inconvenient, but how long would it remain so? No longer than till the Government could find some means of allowing the Established Church some voice in the selection of professors. That could be done by an ordinance, but if it required legislation he thought there would be no difficulty on either side of the House in obtaining it

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 195; Noes, 135. (Division List No. 298.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt.Hn.SirMichaelHicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Rt.HnAilwynEdward
Fergusson, RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, RtHnSirRB.(Inv'rn'ss)
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon, EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnEldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A (Stafford, W.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John(Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Kennaway, Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(MileEnd)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long, Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn.Walter(Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt.HnSirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt.Hon.SirFrederickG.
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles G. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, RtHnJ.Parker(Lanark
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Rt. Hn.SirWilliamH
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wills, Sir Frederick (Bristol,N.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, SirH.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clancy, John Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward Notts
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Findlay, Alexander(Lanark,NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon.Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helm, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife,West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. Morley
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Morley, Rt.Hon.John(Montrose
Muldoon, John
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R.Threshie(Dumfries)
Richards, Thomas
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.
Robertson Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, RtHnC.R.(Northants
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJT.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said that the effect of the Amendment standing in his name was that in order to make any change in the doctrine or discipline of the Established Church of Scotland, the consent of two-thirds of the presbyteries in Scotland would be necessary. He quite admitted that, at present, any Act of the General Assembly must have the consent of a majority of presbyteries if that Act dealt with a change of formula. At present the State prescribed the formula by Act of Parliament, and that made the contract between the clergymen of the Established Church and the State. That contract affected not only the ecclesiastical but the civil rights of the clergymen. It was altogether different dealing with a State Church and a voluntary Church; because in the former there were State endowments and in the latter none. In the Church of Scotland the presbyteries consisted equally of clergymen and elders or laymen. But some of the presbyteries were large and many small. Obviously, therefore, a majority of the presbyteries might not really represent the opinion of the whole Church in a matter of such great importance as a change in the formula. He did not know of any question which might give rise to more dispute in the Church as a whole than a change of formula, and he doubted the wisdom of giving to the Church the right of throwing this bone of contention into the presbyteries where, though there were not High Church and Low Church parties, as in England, the evangelical party might object to any change in the formula and so cause dispute in the Church. Where parties were pretty evenly divided, the question in dispute might be reopened over and over again and the interests of the Church would suffer. If any question of a change of formula could only be decided by a majority of two-thirds of the presbyteries, then the chances of a final settlement would be secured. The present formula was being signed by most ministers of the Church of Scotland without much "boggle," and so far as he could see there was no great hankering for any change. Everyone knew that the Confession of Faith was a very old formula and was only understood in a very general sense; and that old Acts of Parliament were never construed in accordance with the strict language of the Act, but in accordance with the opinions of the present time. In cases of heresy, in which a clergyman was charged with not conforming to the Confession of Faith, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland was the ultimate Court of Appeal; and no disadvantage was found in that now. There was, therefore, no hardship in asking that when any change was proposed to be made in the formularies that that should be decided by the vote of two-thirds of the presbyteries. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 24, to leave out the words 'the majority,' and insert the words 'not less than two thirds.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the majority' stand part of the clause."

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said he hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment. The clause had been framed on the analogy of the Barrier Act, which was passed in 1697 for the regulation of serious changes in the constitution of the Church of Scotland, which had regulated its procedure ever since, and which had been adopted by the Free Church—he could not speak positively as to the United Presbyterian Church—as sufficient to safeguard the interests of that Church. According to the Barrier Act it was provided that for preventing any sudden alteration or innovation or other prejudice of the Church doctrine, worship, discipline, or government thereof, it was appointed and enacted that before any General Assembly of the Church should pass any Act to be binding according to the rules and constitution of the Church, the same must be made by overture to the General Assembly, and then, having been passed by the General Assembly, be sent down to the presbyteries and come back to the General Assembly for final decision. So that the change had to be before the General Assembly once, with an interval to go to the presbyteries to be passed by the majority of the presbyteries, and then come to the General Assembly to be finally disposed of. The presbyteries numbered eighty-four and they were made up of the number of parishes in the district. He agreed that some of them were small, with only five parishes; but some ran up to as many as 100 parishes.

The constitution of a presbytery was made up in this way: every minister within the bounds was a member, and he was accompanied by an elder from his own session, so that the presbytery was composed equally of clergymen and laymen corresponding to the number of parishes. The Bill secured that any proposed change of formula should be first passed by the majority of the General Assembly, that that proposed change should be sent down to the presbyteries, that it must be passed by a majority of the eighty-four presbyteries, composed equally of clergy and laity, and that it must then come back to the General Assembly to be approved by a majority of its members. He, therefore, submitted that the terms of the Barrier Act, which was passed to prevent any sudden alteration or innovation or other prejudice to the doctrine or discipline of the Church of Scotland, and which had had that effect for more than 200 years, was sufficient guarantee against serious change in the constitution or doctrine of the Church of Scotland. The precautions which already existed were sufficient to meet every case, and he asked the hon. Gentleman not to press his Amendment.

MR. CALDWELL said he felt perfectly certain that, if this power were given to the Church of Scotland, they would find as much variety of opinion in that Church as ever there was in the Free Church, and he felt certain that in that way they were throwing an apple of discord into the Church which had not existed before. He had suggested a remedy. If the State were to hand over the power to alter the formularies, they should at least take care that the decision was not left to a snap division. Everybody knew that very few of the elders attended the presbyteries at all. [Cries of "No, no!"] He had been to the presbytery of Glasgow many times, and he knew what he was talking about. The lay element was really not very much concerned in what went on in the presbytery, and he thought they would find that experience would show he was right in wishing to prescribe that two-thirds should be in favour of any change.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said they had to scrutinise the matter very carefully, because it would probably form an important precedent for England and Wales. It was with some difficulty that he had been able to follow the discussion about presbyteries and elders, and he was much obliged to the Lord-Advocate for explaining the composition of the Established Church. As he understood it, it would be quite possible for the minority of the Church of Scotland to alter the doctrine of the Church. He candidly confessed he might be wrong, but that was how he understood it. The Lord-Advocate said there was great disparity between these presbyteries. In one they might have 100 parishes and in another four parishes. If, therefore, they were going to leave it to be decided by the majority of the presbyteries, they might have about a dozen presbyteries containing a majority of population overruled by seventy-two presbyteries containing a minority of population. He knew it was subject to reference from the General Assembly, but he was not sure that the majority of the General Assembly might not represent the minority of the Church as well. As he understood it, the General Assembly consisted, roughly speaking, of the ministers of the Established Church and of an elder from each presbytery; and a bare majority of the General Assembly, representing a small minority of the adherents and members of the Church, might alter the formula of the Church in the teeth of the majority of the Church itself.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said the representation of presbyteries in the General Assembly depended upon their size.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the original point he was about to make still held good, because they might have one church with 150 members with the same representation in the General Assembly as a church with 1,000 members. That was not one vote, one value. It was just like the Redistribution scheme of the Government. Therefore, a bare majority in the General Assembly, with a bare majority of the presbyteries, might carry a very important change of doctrine in the teeth of the vast majority of the people of Scotland. That seemed to him grossly unfair; and, if it were a precedent, and of course it was, it was a very serious one, as people in this country were beginning to realise. If that were the basis on which it was to be done, they might find in the Church of England a number of clergy, representing the minority, changing the doctrine in a particular fashion. He did not mind that so long as they were Free Churches and had their own property, created by the devotion of their own members; but when they were dealing with national property it was a different matter, and he thought it behoved the House of Commons to temper the sweeping proposal of the Government. It was very remarkable that the Government should introduce a proposal of that kind when they considered that by the judgment of the House of Lords, which the Bill was introduced to amend, a small minority was able to give its veto to a vast majority of a Church. Yet they were prepared to leave it to a bare majority to alter the formula. He should have pleasure in supporting the Amendment.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said he did not think the hon. Member for Mid.-Lanarkshire had correctly represented the attendance at the presbyteries.

MR. ELLIOT (Durham) said he would make an appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite not to insist on these trifling Amendments. Really, after the speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down, and who confessed that his knowledge might not be correct, he felt that the time of the Committee was being wasted at the expense of action which he should have thought would have commended itself to ninety-nine out of every 100 Liberals.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he could not allow the speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down to pass. He had made a thoroughly irrelevant speech. He talked about wasting time, and of his knowledge of the General Assembly. He took his information from the Lord-Advocate, and he accepted the correction he gave him.

MR. ELLIOT: I did not say it was not correct.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the hon. Gentleman said that it was a trifling Amendment. Would he regard it as a trifling matter if the documents of the Church of England were altered by a mere chance majority. ["Question."] It was the question, surely. If it were not the question, then the speech of the hon. Member was completely out of order. If his speech were in order, then his (Mr. Lloyd-George's) speech must also be in order. Did he mean to say he would regard it as a trifling matter to allow the Convocation of the clergy, representing the minority, to alter the formula of the Church of England? If he did not, then it was no trifling matter in this case. Was it because he regarded Presbyterians as beneath his notice? If it were important in the case of one Church it must be important in the case of another, and, therefore, the observations of the hon. Member were without justification.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 210; Noes, 115. (Division List No. 299.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hon.Sir H
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W.(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt Hn Sir Michael Hicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Buxton, NE(York.NR, Whitby
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Wor.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton

Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crombie, John William
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Ellice, CaptEC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Doulgas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, RtHnAilwynEdward
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn.SirJ(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, RtHnSirRB(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, W.Raymond-(Cambs.)
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, SirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hoult, Joseph
Howard,John(Kent Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt.Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, RtHn SirHE.(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hon.SirFrederickG.
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott(Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, SirH.(Renfrew)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, RtHnJ.Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir MarkJ.M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, Harold John
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset
Wills, Sir Frederick (Bristol,N.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirWH.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen Charles P.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmot
Benn, John Williams
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dobbie, Joseph

Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts).
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander(Lanark,NE
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Harcourt, Lewis
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon, Charles H.
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E.(Morley)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,David Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir CharlesBenjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw.(Fermanagh,N.)
Morley,Rt.Hon.John(Montrose
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Reid, SirR.Threshie(Dumfries)
Richards, Thomas
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas.Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Woodhouse, SirJ.T.(Huddersf'.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Hunter Craig.

*MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) moved in line 24, after "thereof," to insert "any formula so prescribed shall be laid as soon as may be before both Houses of Parliament, and if either House of Parliament within the next forty days resolves that the formula ought to be annulled it shall, after the date of that Resolution, be of no effect." He said that this Amendment would, to a certain extent, meet the two points which had already been discussed, viz., that of the professorial tests, because it would retain a certain measure of Parliamentary control, and that of the majority of the presbyteries, because it would add to those already existing another presbytery in the shape of the House of Commons which would approach these questions from a more detached point of view than the existing presbyteries, and could be relied upon to give a more impartial and unbiassed opinion. But it should be clearly recognised that the Amendment raised also the much larger question of whether an Established Church was to be allowed to have a blank cheque in the matter of its formula of subscription. He knew that this description of a "blank cheque" would be contested; but he was certain that they were giving to the Church of Scotland a blank cheque in respect of its formula of subscription, and if it was a blank cheque in the matter of the formula of subscription it was a blank cheque in the matter of the doctrines and the standards of the Church. The point, therefore, to consider was whether it was possible to give that liberty in the case of an Established Church and still to consider it as having any special relationship with the State.

On the Second Reading of the Bill the Prime Minister said that religious bodies would always find in him an advocate of freedom and of union. They could all subscribe to those words, but after all it was rather a cryptic utterance, which depended on the formula of subscription. The immediate problem before the Committee was not the general question of freedom and union in religious bodies, but the question of reconciling the freedom of an Established Church with its union to the civil power. That was a very difficult problem, and, as the Prime Minister had said, no formula had ever been found or probably ever would be to fit all Churches or all countries. He was perfectly clear, however, that the principle of an Established Church as we knew it in England and Scotland was that there should be some relation between Church and State, not only in regard to temporalities, but in regard to doctrine and creed professed. The only question the Committee had to consider, having regard to the condition and constitution of the Church of Scotland, was as to the degree and rigour with which that principle should be applied, and he submitted with confidence that the words he proposed were the very mildest application of the principle of union between Church and State. In the matter of the Church of England the circumstances were entirely different, and it was impossible to argue from the one Church to the other. At the same time, the principle was the same, and they had to consider the precedents from the point of view of the Church of England, and he agreed with the hon. Member for Carnarvon that when Parliament came to deal with the Church of England from a constructive point of view, if ever that day arrived, they would have to deal with the precedent the Government were creating by this Bill. He was sometimes charged with being an Erastian. He did not know anybody who was not an Erastian; certainly the Prime Minister was one, because only the other day the right hon. Gentleman stated that it was impossible to separate the relations of Church and State, or to prevent the spiritual from perplexing the temporal power or the temporal power from interfering with the spiritual.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In all Churches.

*MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR: Yes; and I say that that is Erastianism.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I merely want my hon. friend to quote me accurately, and I am not sure that he was doing so. He seemed to think that the doctrine I laid down referred only to the Established Church, whereas it is of universal application to all Churches.

*MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said he quite recognised that, and it was merely an extension of the principle. If it was true of non-Established Churches it was certainly true of Established Churches, and it was because of the impossibility of divorcing the relations of Church and State in regard to Established Churches that he submitted that they were all, whether they liked it or not, Erastians. The Church of Scotland itself was Erastian. He would not trouble the Committee with the Confession of Faith in detail, but he held in his hand a statement prepared—

> "On behalf of the Church Interests Committee of the Church of Scotland with a view to explain the legal and historical position of the Confession of Faith and the formula in the Church of Scotland, and the scope of the proposed legislation in regard to the formula."

And, while he did not accept their line of argument, he would quote as an illustration what that Committee said on the question of Parliamentary interference—

> "The objection is urged against the proposal to leave the formula to the Church that the formula may be so conceived as to abrogate important parts of the Confession, and that Parliament could not interfere if the Church took that course. This can only mean that Parliament could not consistently or in fairness interfere. But this criticism proceeds upon a misapprehension. The Confession remains ratified by Parliament as the public and avowed Confession of the Church, and Parliament gives no licence to the Church to frame a formula which is inconsistent with that enactment. The liberty given to the Church under the proposed measure must fall to be construed under reference to the Act of 1690, and if the Church were to take any action in relation to the formula inconsistent with that Act, there would clearly be ground for Parliamentary interference."

He submitted, therefore, that there should be an end to all talk about complete spiritual independence as regarded the Church of Scotland. The Church of Scotland did not take up any such position in the latest memorandum upon the subject. The Church of Scotland accepted the principle, and declared that even if a formula were proposed without consent of Parliament it must still be on the lines of the Act of 1690 or Parliament would have the right to interfere. Therefore, he thought his argument held good that the Church of Scotland accepted the principle of State interference in certain contingencies even in matters spiritual.

He wished to develop that argument further, and to point out that there appeared to be some misapprehension as to what would really be the effect of this clause. This clause would give a blank cheque to the General Assembly to make whatever formula it liked from time to time. They knew that a formula made to-day by the General Assembly would be in the direction of relaxation, but fifty years hence it might be in quite another direction. Therefore, they were leaving to the General Assembly power to make a formula which might be changed from time to time and about which Parliament would know nothing whatever. No doubt it would be argued that the formula would be governed by the Confession of Faith. So far from that being the case, he thought the formula would govern the Confession. How had the demand for this formula arisen? It had arisen because of the extreme precision and definite doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith. It was so precise and clear, so rigorous, and so hopelessly unflinching in all its definitions that this demand for relaxation had naturally arisen in the Church of Scotland. That being so, it was quite clear that it was the formula of subscription which was going to govern the Westminster Confession, and not the Westminster Confession which was going to govern the formula. It was not by altering the Westminster Confession that the Church of Scotland was going to modify its position, but by the more easy and practical way of substituting a relaxed formula which placed a different interpretation upon that Confession.

He thought the Committee would recognise that what they were dealing with now was that they were being asked to give to the Church of Scotland full liberty to vary its doctrines and standards by the direct application of a modified formula of subscription to its ministers, and therefore they were making an entirely new departure in the relation between Church and State. He objected to that on two grounds. In the first place, as regarded the Church of Scotland, it seemed to him that while it was eminently desirable to give the Church liberty, it was not desirable to carry that to the point of depriving the State of all connection with the spiritual development of the Church of Scotland. It was desirable that the Church and State should be kept at least in contact as regarded the development of the Church, and he submitted that the words which he now proposed were eminently fitted to keep the State really cognisant of what was happening in the Church. He fully recognised the difference between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England, but he objected to this clause from the point of view of the Church of England. He was aware that a great many of his Scotch friends thought that he was needlessly alarmed, and that no precedent would ever be applied from the Church of Scotland to the Church of England. But while it was quite possible that no direct precedent could be quoted because the circumstances were different, the principle between Church and State was identical although its application might be different. Therefore he viewed a clause which was a breach of that principle with the greatest apprehension from the point of view of the Church of England.

He would probably be told that the constitution of the Church of England was entirely different from that of the Church of Scotland. Of course that was evident to anyone who knew anything of the history of the two Churches. But while that was perfectly true, they were bound to recognise that not only was the Church of Scotland in a state of transition, but the Church of England was also in a state of transition, not only as regarded its doctrines, but in regard to a movement which in some directions was of the most reactionary character; and it was also in a state of transition as regarded its form of government. There was in the Church of England to-day a distinct movement in the direction of self-government, and therefore they had to consider in the future whether or not what was now being done was going to be a precedent in dealing with the Church of England. In the case of the Church of England he freely admitted all the difference alluded to in regard to its constitution, but, as he had already said, the Church of England was in a state of transition, and he wished to protect, in advance, this Church against the application of a principle which he believed was wholly unsuited to its present condition. Therefore, while the relations between Church and State were what they were at present in England, those who thought with him, that it was of supreme importance that the spiritual connection between Church and State should be maintained in England as well as in Scotland, were bound to protest against a proposal which they thought would be dangerous if applied to the Church of England.

The words which he suggested were, he thought, the very mildest form that could be used if anything whatever was to be inserted in modification of the clause. He was sure that hon. Members from Scotland on both sides of the House would not accuse him of a desire to be provocative in regard to the Church of Scotland or the non-Established Churches, but he felt that if this clause were allowed to go through they were parting with something which they should never recover—something which might be a loss in the national life of Scotland, and which might lead to a loss in the national life of England. Therefore he felt bound to do all that he could to prevent the loss taking place. The words of the Amendment had been carefully considered. It might be fairly contended that the contingency which he suggested would never arise. He thought it was extremely improbable that in the case of the Church of Scotland any necessity for Parliamentary action would or could ever arise. The constitution of the Church of Scotland was so democratic that he did not believe that, except under most exceptional circumstances, a case for Parliamentary interference under the Amendment could possibly arise. But he did not think that ought to be an argument to any Member of the Committee who sympathised with the views he was now expressing for not inserting the words. These words were, after all, an assertion of the principle of the connection between Church and State in matters spiritual which he thought most important, and the importance of which would be more and more realised. The members of the Established Church who desired to maintain it as an Established Church would surely do well to recognise the desirability of having the changes in their spiritual development registered. The High Commissioner was part and parcel of the ecclesiastical machinery in Scotland, and it was surely desirable that whatever they did in the region of their doctrinal development should be laid before Parliament in some shape or other. He trusted the Amendment would receive the careful and favourable consideration of the Government. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 24, after the word 'thereof,' to insert the words 'any formula so prescribed shall be laid as soon as may be before both Houses of Parliament, and if either House of Parliament within the next forty days resolves that the formula ought to be annulled, it shall, after the date of that Resolution, be of no effect.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am sure the House is very anxious to come to a decision on this point, and I shall therefore abstain from yielding to the temptation of dealing with that part of my hon. friend's speech in which he criticised something which fell from me some days ago. The hon. Gentleman asks us to refuse to give to the Scottish Church a boon which he does not deny that Church desires, and which he does not deny would be a benefit to the Church, because the time may some day come when somebody in this House or the other House will point to this clause as a precedent. I do not think that is a sufficient ground for rejecting or modifying the clause. The danger, if it be a danger, is remote and uncertain, and the fact of quoting a precedent of this kind from a Church which in history and tradition is quite different from the English Church will not strengthen the case for change in regard to the English Church. If changes are made in the relation of that Church to the State or in its internal constitution, they will be made upon the intrinsic merits of the question then before the House and the country, and they will not be modified one way or another by any policy we may adopt in favour of a Church which by its history and tradition is so widely separated from its sister Established Church in this country.

My hon. friend appears to think that there is a principle, a single principle, of establishment. But the smallest consideration of the constitution of the Scottish Church and its relation to the State will show that that is historically inaccurate, and that can be proved by a mere appeal to history. The appeal to history is equally conclusive with regard to this particular case. My hon. friend has said over and over again that we are now taking a new departure. The new departure is a reversion to the Act of 1690, which first established the Church in Scotland. How can that be called a new departure? It is a reversion to the old original constitution of the Established Church, It is true that is modified by the Act of 1693, as the House is aware, but it was not modified with the view of drawing tighter the bonds between the Scottish Parliament and the Scottish Church. It was not intended to carry out those Erastian doctrines which my hon. friend very inaccurately ascribed to me. It was carried out for a perfectly different object, and in reverting to the condition of things after the Act of 1690 we are not starting a new question. We are not embarking on some unknown voyage. We are not travelling over unmapped continents. We are only giving the Church liberty in one department which it has enjoyed absolutely in another department with regard to the subscription to the Confession of Faith. As my hon. friend is probably aware from this debate, if not from a study of the question, the Scottish Church has had freedom to determine what are to be the terms of subscription for lay elders who have as integral and as inevitable a share in Church government as the clergy. The Church has exercised that power from time immemorial. It has exercised it with wisdom, discretion, and moderation, and all that this clause asks—all that my hon. friend desires to take away from it—is that the Church should be allowed to revert to its original constitution and allowed to exercise over the whole field of subscription a liberty which it has enjoyed, and never abused, with regard to a large portion of that field. I hope the Committee will reject the Amendment.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): I have always thought it a great pity when the House of Commons is asked to express its opinion on religious matters. The hon. Gentleman has put forward his Amendment practically on the ground of the ultimate possible effect of the Bill on the Church of England. I entirely decline to take the view that the ultimate possible effect of the Bill upon the Church of England or the clergy of the Church of England ought to have any relation whatever to the discussion and the decision of this House on any question relating to the Church of Scotland. No one who knows the history of the two countries and of the two Churches can fail to know that in their origin, constitution, traditions, and attitude towards the State they are totally different. That is one of the reasons why I cannot follow my hon. friend. Another reason is that my hon. friend proposed that any formula which might be hereafter adopted by the Church of Scotland might be annulled by the vote of one or other of the Houses of Parliament. Supposing that there was a universal wish in Scotland to vary the formula of the Church of Scotland, is a vote of the House of Lords to annul that formula? I object to that as a Scotchman entirely on principle; and, quite apart from the theological question, on which I have no intention to enter, I think it will be a great misfortune if the Amendment of my hon. friend is carried.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) said he was sorry to intervene on this subject, especially as it was a Scottish one; but really the English worm must turn at last. He thought that English Members had a perfect right to intervene in this matter when they believed that a principle was involved which was wider than Scotland. The Prime Minister had said that his hon friend's Amendment would deprive the Scottish Church of a boon. His hon. friend did not propose to do anything of the kind. The Church had a perfect liberty to draw up its own formula, but what the Amendment proposed was that the change should be laid on the Table of the House, and that it might be annulled within forty days. But did anyone suppose that that would ever happen in practice? It was said that the Amendment would be a restriction on the freedom of the Church. They were all in favour of freedom, but they were also in favour of order. The time might come when there would be another temper in the public mind which was not in favour of freedom. The question was, was the House once and for all to part company with the principle involved in establishment, so far as the Church of Scotland was concerned? The Prime Minister had said something about different principles of establishment. Now, he contended, that there were different degrees of establishment, but there were not different principles of establishment. They all knew that the degree of establishment in the Church of Scotland was very different from the degree of establishment in the Church of England. He was old enough to remember that the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Free Church of Scotland were divided on the question of establishment, and it was that question which divided the Wee Frees and the United Frees.

The CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Member was not in order in pursuing that line of argument.

Mr. HARWOOD said he only wanted to reply to the Prime Minister. The one thing which had brought this Bill into existence was the very principle which the Prime Minister had tried to make light of. He himself was in favour of the principle of establishment, but this was not a question of whether they held with Established Churches or not. It was a question whether if a Church was established and continued to be established, it was to stand in a proper relation to the nation. The established Church had duties to perform to the State, and the State had duties to perform to the Church. The nation through Parliament was bound to see that an Established Church did not offer a religion of which the nation could not approve. Let them do away with the Established Church if they liked, but so long as they had such an institution the principles of the establishment must be maintained. He asked the House seriously to consider before parting with the great principle of establishment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 86; Noes, 219. (Division List No. 300.)

AYES.

Allen, Charles P.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cremer, William Randal
Delany, William
Duncan, J. Hastings
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander(Lanark,NE
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Spencer, Rt.HnC R(Northants.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walton, John Lawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Austin Taylor and Mr. Harwood.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hon.SirH
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt.HnGeraldW(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt.Hn.SirMichaelHicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir W. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brymer, William Ernest
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Buxton, N.E.(York,NRWhitby
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crombie, John William
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dobbie, Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Ellice, Capt E C(S.Andr's Bghs
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, RtHnAilwynEdward
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Rt.HnSirRB.(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, SirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, SirA.(Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hoult, Joseph
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Joicey, Sir James
Kennaway, Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long, Col. Charles. (Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hn SirHE.(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W JH.(Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir FrederickG.
Montagu, Hon.J.Scott (Hants.
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morley, Rt.Hon.John(Montrose
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newnes, Sir George
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Parrott, William
Percy, Earl
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col.Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Reid, Sir R.Threshie (Dumfries)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Thomas
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, Rt.HnJParker(Lanarks
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt.Hon.Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E.(Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Tennant, Harold John
Tomlinson, Sir Wm, Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Loyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und.Lyne

Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Noes—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Viscount Valentia.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

ALIENS BILL.

[Third Reading.]

Order for Third Reading read.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) referred to some of the criticisms which had been made upon the measure and to changes which had been effected in its provisions. He said the whole object of the Bill was to deal with immigrants who came here in bulk at certain ports. It was only one class of passengers which came in this way and so came under the operation of this Bill. But, after all, it was this class of passenger which supplied the undesirable population in this country and caused a great expense to be thrown on the ratepayers. The Government had no desire to exclude those who could maintain themselves and their dependents decently, but they did desire to prevent the ratepayers being put to the expense of maintaining those who came to this country in a destitute condition, and to keep out those who were not desirable on account of their being lunatics, or idiots, or convicted criminals. Complaint had been made that an undue charge was being placed on the shipowners in making them responsible during a certain period for the maintenance of the persons they brought over to this country and liable to take back immigrants who were found to be undesirable. He did not, however, think shipowners had any great grievance. The House must remember that the profit of bringing over aliens went to them, and if anyone ought to bear some liability in the matter it was surely the shipowners themselves. The complaint had come chiefly from the other side of the House; whereas the majority of the shipowners in the House sat, he believed, on the Ministerial side, and they had expressed satisfaction at the way in which the Government had endeavoured to meet them.

Amendments had been made in the Bill to enable transmigrants to dispense with examination, the shipowners giving security that they were passed through this country. It had been said that it was a hardship to the shipowner that he should have to provide accommodation for inspection at the quayside or elsewhere in the neighbourhood of the ship. But it must be remembered that had not a concession been made the examination would have taken place on board ship, and that if shipowners desired to avoid expense the examination could still be held on board. He had made inquiry on the subject from shipowners, and he could not ascertain that any great cost, if any cost at all, would be cast upon them. In the case of nearly all the big lines the shipowners themselves possessed buildings in which the examination could be held. It had been said that it would be a hardship if the shipowners were compelled to take back an alien who had arrived in this country before the passing of the Bill or who had passed through the machinery at the port. He thought the Member for Liverpool had proved his case, and the Bill had been modified in this respect, without, he believed, impairing the principle of the measure.

A desire had been expressed on both sides of the House that no political or religious refugee should be turned back from these shores for want of means. It had never been the desire of the Government to exclude such refugees. The difficulty had been to find suitable words which would not offer facilities for evading the Bill. He thought that the Amendment originally proposed by the

Prime Minister really met all the genuine cases, and that though it did not go so far as the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean desired, the larger proportion of Members on both sides felt that it was a perfectly fair proposal. The point had been made that the Bill made destitution a ground for exclusion; but in reply to that he would urge that the class which unfortunately was generally destitute was the class which had caused a great deal of inconvenience and suffering to the working classes in certain portions of London and the country, and it would have been impossible to bring forward an effective Bill if they had not dealt with this class.

It had been argued that it might be possible for criminals who could pay a higher fare for their sea route to come to this country in spite of the Bill. That was perfectly true; but in the third clause there were provisions for expelling them from these shores, and there were also provisions in Clause 1 which dealt with those who had been convicted under an extradition treaty. A number of these men were well known at the short seaports, and there would be no difficulty in dealing with them. The expulsion clauses would rid us of a large number of foreign criminals who had been convicted in this country and to a large extent populated our prisons, occasioning a great deal of expenditure to the taxpayers. Quite apart from the preventive clauses of the Bill, he expected that it would have a very considerable deterrent effect in preventing the class of aliens aimed at from entering the country. That had certainly been the case in America. He thought the House would be well advised to pass the Third Reading. The Government had sought to make concessions to the House and to meet certain hardships, but the principle of the Bill remained what it was when the measure was introduced, and he felt certain that if it became law proper administration of its provisions would secure the object which the promoters had in view.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight), in moving that the Bill be read a third time this day three months, acknowledged the courteous spirit in which the Home Secretary had conducted the measure through the House and Committee. But, as the right hon. Gentleman said, the Bill remained the same in principle in spite of the changes made in it, and for that reason he would continue to oppose it. He did so on three grounds. First, the Bill was a sham Bill in regard to the exclusion of criminals. Secondly, it was introduced with a double purpose, and though the Prime Minister and many of his colleagues had no intention by its means of keeping out efficient and competing workmen, their supporters went up and down the country declaring that that was their object. Thirdly, it was an infraction of a high and great principle on the most flimsy grounds and for the most trifling consideration.

It was a sham to say that the criminal could be kept out by this Bill, and the Home Secretary had practically admitted it in his speech. In order to come face to face with the immigration officer the well-known criminal would have to commit two acts of incredible folly. He would have to select an immigrant ship going to an immigrant port and get nineteen other malefactors to accompany him, and then he would have to take a steerage passage, although he need only spend a few extra shillings in order to become a cabin passenger, Supposing the foreign criminal had committed these two great acts of folly, and had at last met the immigration officer face to face, there were still several easy loopholes of escape for him. After his offence had been proved he could plead that it had a political significance, or that he was fleeing from religious persecution. If he came from a country where there was any persecution whatever going on, he would probably be able to convince the immigration authorities that he was entitled to come in. It had been computed that the odds against being killed on an English railway were 200 millions to one, and he believed the odds against catching a criminal under this Bill would be at least as great. All the authorities who had been consulted—

including the Home Office itself, in the person of Sir Kenelm Digby—had agreed that while the powers of expulsion might be valuable, those of exclusion would be nugatory.

Another ground of objection was that the Bill was proposed with a double purpose. It would not include a single efficient competing alien workman; that was not the intention of the Bill, nor was there the machinery to do it. The measure could not possibly have any protective effect in that direction. But he objected to the Bill also because it marked the abandonment of a great and high principle which, if not immemorial, had been slowly and laboriously built up—the principle that to keep out people because they were miserable and without means was neither wise nor right. He was glad to note that the Members who specifically represented labour in the House had refused to be seduced by the suspicious pretensions of keeping out competing labour, and they had found an unexpected ally in the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, who had probably done more to amend the Bill than any other Member of the House. The noble Lord had held up the ideal of a Christian Church, all-embracing, and including all races and all colours, and contended that, however poor, persons should be admitted if they were in any way damaged or damnified by holding their creed. That was only a part of the still higher doctrine of the great commonwealth of humanity, held by hon. Members on that side of the House, and it was because they believed that humanity could be regarded as a great commonwealth that they opposed the policy of the exclusion of the poor and miserable.

The Prime Minister had asked whether this country was to extend the Act of Elizabeth to the destitute all over the world. To that question there was a crushing reply. What was the extent of the burden imposed? According to the latest returns £13,000,000 was spent by this country in poor relief; and of that sum only £29,000 was spent in relief to aliens. For the sake of saving such a sum the Government were prepared to abandon a great and high principle. Whether it were popular or unpopular, he at any rate would continue to oppose so fatuous a policy. It was not as though the Government had a clean record in this matter. The very Government who proposed to exclude these people from the United Kingdom had deliberately imported into South Africa a mass of people who, according to the latest statistics, were far more criminal than any aliens who had ever come to this country. That, surely, was the height of cynicism, and then from that height they descended to the lowest depth by proposing for the sake of 29,000 paltry sovereigns to abandon a great, high, and generous principle. He begged to move.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland), as another unrepentant opponent of the Bill, seconded the Amendment. Recent elections had shown that there was not that enthusiasm for the Bill which hon. Members opposite had alleged, the truth of the matter being that the outside public had observed that the Opposition had been able to make good their main propositions that the Bill was trivial and that it infringed a high principle of national policy. Such popularity as it had really enjoyed had arisen from the belief that from 75,000 to 80,000 aliens came and settled in this country every year, and that the Bill would put a stop to the influx. The glamour of that protective idea had, however, largely evaporated. The spokesmen of the Government had steadily set their faces against the idea that this was a great protective measure. Although the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had claimed it as the beginning of his protective policy, the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary had consistently adopted a different line of argument, and recommended the Bill as a measure of sanitary regulation, for the exclusion of criminals, and for the relief of the rates. But the Government had been unable to do anything with the argument from figures. No doubt it was impossible to give within two or three hundred the actual number of aliens who came and settled in the country, but according to the Census Returns the alien population increased on the average by 7,000 or 8,000 a year, and that number was doubtless approximately correct. What, then, became of the alleged 75,000 or 80,000? Moreover, in

America only one in 100 aliens was excluded, and, as they excluded many classes who would not be touched by this Bill, it was only reasonable to suppose that the proportion would not reach even that figure in this country. One-fifth of the aliens excluded from America were contract labourers, and no allowance was made for religious persecution. Therefore the number excluded here would probably be very small indeed, and for this pitiful result there was to be set up a great machinery in eleven of our ports, and £24,000 of national money expended in order to save, as the Government themselves had admitted, £29,000 of local money, a large part of which was paid by aliens themselves, who in certain districts were large ratepayers.

In one respect only had the Bill been successful—it had enabled the Government to pass another session. It was the supreme effort of legislation for this year. The Government had the magnificent record of having passed a Bill which would keep out five dinghy-loads of tatterdemalions. The Bill would set up a machinery which some future and more powerful protectionist Government, if ever there was such a one, would be able to use and extend, and he was opposed to this class of legislation and feared its extension. He gladly admitted that the right of asylum had to some extent been reserved by the Amendment that had been forced on the Government by the action of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, but the Bill still contained the detestable poverty test to which he objected. This Bill did not provide a proper method for dealing with sweaters. The sweater in this country was of British make; he was allowed to exist by our laws. If we had proper laws there would be no sweating. The British landowner who would not part with his land was responsible for overcrowding. The Opposition were only too anxious to deal with overcrowding and sweating, but they would not find salvation by excluding a shipload of aliens. We should make laws to control our monopolists, and not bully aliens in order to conceal our own neglect, indifference, and bad laws.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months."—(*Major Seely.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney), referring to the argument of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for the Isle of Wight that the Bill would not exclude foreign criminals from landing in this country, insisted that the measure would carry out what had always been the intention of the Government, namely, that the magistrates and Judges should have the power of expelling those who misbehaved themselves after they came here and put themselves in reach of the law. With regard to the hon. and gallant Gentleman's charge that the Bill was brought forward for electioneering purposes, he must ask him to settle accounts with his colleagues on the benches opposite and with those Liberal candidates in East-End constituencies who had, over and over again, supported the policy embodied in the Bill, and who had petitioned the leaders of the Party to allow the Bill to pass. [OPPOSITION cries of dissent.]

*MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): There was not one of the candidates or Members who, in asking our Front Bench not to oppose the Second Reading, expressed approval of the Bill.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON informed the hon. Gentleman opposite that one candidate, after making inquiries for himself in the constituency of Stepney, came to the conclusion that this very legislation was urgently necessary, and expressed approval of every principle contained in the Bill.

*MR. CREMER: How many more?

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON said there was also Mr. Stopford Brooke, the candidate for Bow and Bromley, who had appeared on a platform in the East End which was adorned with several hon. Members opposite, and expressed himself very strongly in favour of the Bill. He would also quote from his own speeches the views of the hon. Member for Poplar with regard to this legislation.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The hon. and gallant Gentleman and some of his friends are perpetually mentioning my name. I expressed my views with regard to the Bill in the Second Reading debate, and it does not seem necessary to repeat them on every occasion, especially as hon. Gentlemen opposite desire to get this Bill through. If I am silent it is not because I have altered my views.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON said he had not accused the hon. Gentleman of altering his views.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Then leave me alone.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON said he had not the slightest intention of leaving the hon. Gentleman alone. Declarations of a clear and emphatic character on this question from the Front Bench opposite were so rare that he should quote, and quote on every possible occasion, the views of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Poplar. He was glad that the hon. Gentleman had not changed his views; but he could wish that he had supported them, both in the lobby and by speech, more firmly and stoutly than he had seen fit to do.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: And so obstruct the Bill.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON said they had heard in the course of this debate all sorts of charges against this Bill. They had been told by hon. Gentlemen opposite that it had been introduced in consequence of a spurious agitation, that the Bill would keep out nobody, that it would inflict a great hardship upon aliens and ruin the shipping trade, and that there was absolutely no demand for it amongst the working classes or the trades unions. Let any Member who suspected it was a spurious agitation enter any of the few remaining houses in his constituency occupied by English families and hear proofs of the reality of the alien grievance. Every candidate, every clergyman, labour leaders such as Mr. Steadman, all believed in the necessity for such legislation, and before the Royal Commission representatives of the trades affected strongly pleaded for a Bill such as this. He yielded to no man in sympathy for the persecuted, but he could not ignore the sufferings of our own unemployed workmen displaced in their occupations and in their homes by these alien immigrants. It had been said that this Bill only dealt with a local grievance, but witness after witness before the Royal Commission urged them to report in favour of a Bill of this kind. In Yorkshire the Stockton Trades Council recently passed the following resolution to send to the Labour Representation Conference which was to be held in January next—

> "That the Labour Representation Committee be instructed to promote legislation to stop the landing of pauper aliens in this country, as being detrimental to the best interest of the workmen of this country."

That resolution was carried by nine to five. Evidence of a similar kind was given in favour of this Bill by trades union witnesses from Lancashire, Leeds, Sheffield, and other places. Petitions had been presented from many of the leading trades unions urging the Government to legislate in the direction in which they were now doing under this Bill. The representative of the gasworkers in London said that in one large works alone there were 800 aliens employed. In face of these facts what nonsense it was to talk of the unemployed when so much employment which Englishmen were ready and willing to undertake was being taken from them by aliens. They had heard a great deal of sympathy expressed for the aliens by hon. Gentlemen opposite, but not one word of sympathy in these debates had been spoken by members of the Opposition in regard to the sufferings of our own people, who had been completely ignored by hon. Gentlemen opposite. In his own small Division of Stepney 425 houses in the past twelve months had become occupied by foreign aliens. Of these houses 379 had been occupied by English families. On a moderate estimate the 425 houses were now occupied by at least eight aliens each, so that in twelve months there had been an influx of 3,400 aliens into the Parliamentary Division of Stepney alone. And yet they were told so aliens were coming in and that they were a diminishing quantity. In February, 1903, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Poplar urged the Government to introduce this legislation, and he said—

> "He did not care whether the alien immigrant were Jew, Turk, or infidel, or what nationality he belonged to; what he objected to was the refuse of Europe being dumped down on these shores."

He further said—

> "It was stated that he trades unions could look after the working hours of these people, but destitute aliens were ready to accept very low wages and long hours, and this made it impossible in some trades for trades unions to be formed at all."

Dealing with the housing problem the hon. Member for Poplar said—

> "It was impossible to expect that they could improve the housing of the poor so long as the refuse of the rest of Europe was permitted to come into this country. In the present condition of the working classes of this country it was not right that they should allow these destitute aliens to come in unchecked to reduce the rate of wages and lengthen the hours of work, and seriously affect the proper conditions under which labour ought to be carried out."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Does the hon. and gallant Member say that I made that statement outside of this House?

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON: No, in this House in February, 1903.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Why do you say I have changed my mind?

MAJOR SEELY: Is the hon. and gallant Member in order in referring to speeches made this session in the House of Commons?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and gallant Member said he was quoting from a speech made in the year 1903.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON said he would be perfectly plain with the hon. Member. The hon. Member for Poplar had made a statement in this House strongly supporting this measure which he voted for last year, but in this House this year since the Bill had been introduced the hon. Gentleman had maintained a discreet silence and had done little by vote or speech to forward the measure which he declared last year was so urgently necessary.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he could not understand why the hon. Gentleman persisted in making these violent and unprovoked attacks upon him. He had never disguised his opinion in favour of the Bill. He spoke on the Second Reading, and if he had taken no part in the subsequent debates it was because he understood the Government wanted to get on with the Bill. [OPPOSITION cries of "Withdraw, withdraw!"]

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON said there was nothing to withdraw. He adhered to the opinion which he had already expressed that the hon. Member had declared himself last year strongly in favour of this Bill, and, as far as he was aware, he had done nothing this year, either by vote or speech, to support this measure. Further, his object was to show how strong the feeling was in the East End of London upon this question, and how unjust it was of hon. Gentlemen opposite to accuse the supporters of the Government of getting up an agitation of this kind, and declaring that there was really no grievance at all. The hon. Member for Poplar said in 1903—

> "What could be simpler than to put the obligation in this matter upon the steamship companies? Quite 80 per cent. of these destitute aliens came to London; and practically the whole of them came to three ports in this country, and came from four Continental ports only, and there would be no difficulty about it. The administrative difficulties had been greatly exaggerated, and if the Board of Trade made up its mind to deal with this question and put the responsibility upon the steamship companies they would prevent these destitute aliens coming here."

Those were the very things the Government had done, and would the hon. Member rise in his place and express his approval of this Bill?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Certainly; I am going to vote for the Third Reading.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON said he was glad to hear that. The hon. Member for the Elland Division appeared to argue that because they had at present crime, sweating, and overcrowding in this country they should add to those evils by importing additional evils of the same kind. He had never contended that all these evils were caused by alien immigration, but what he did say was that they were seriously increased by the great influx of poor people from Eastern Europe.

As regarded what the Bill would accomplish it was difficult for anybody to say, until we had experience of its actual administration. He wished to be perfectly frank with the House. He did not say that the Bill contained all that he wished it to contain. He thought the clause which was proposed to exclude contract labour would have been an advantage to the Bill. He should have liked to see a clause to expel fraudulent and professional bankrupts. He thought also the limitation of twenty in the definition of an immigrant ship was too high. It should be reduced to ten, or, in certain cases, to a lower figure. But in his judgment a great step in advance had been made, and he believed firmly that the Bill, if wisely administered, would be productive of great good without inflicting any hardship on people to whom it was desirable to give domicile in this country. They would watch the results with close attention, and if it should appear, as hon. Gentlemen opposite desired that it should appear, that the Bill failed, he for one would not hesitate to press to have it strengthened. He thanked the Government for bringing forward the Bill. Any small effort which he had put forward in promoting the measure had been done wholly and solely for the benefit of the people he represented in particular, and of the country at large.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said the hon. and gallant Member closed his speech by expressing his gratitude to the Government for this Bill. Might he himself express the hope that the Government would afford an early opportunity to the country of expressing its thanks. While listening to the speech of the hon. and gallant Member he wondered whether he really regarded himself as a typical and legitimate representative of English trades unions. There were a good many representatives of English trades unions and English working men in that House, and from every legitimate source or channel, working-class opinion had been one of undivided hostility to the Bill, and, therefore, he would ask the Prime Minister, when winding up the debate to-night, to tell the House from what source he got his mandate for the measure. From what source had he derived information that this measure was required by the country? The ostensible grounds on which the Bill was brought before the House were that in the present state of the law diseased, criminal, and pauper immigrants were admitted into this country.

> "Therefore," said the Prime Minister in a highly anti-protective speech, "this is not a measure associated with protective policy at all. It is a Bill to relieve the people of London especially, and the people of the country at large, from the incubus of pauper immigration."

But the Bill was supposed to be founded on the Report of the Royal Commission. He invited the attention of hon. Members opposite to statistics with relation to pauperism among the alien population. He would take the case of the Metropolis, because it was conceded that alien immigration was objectionable in the Metropolis in a pre-eminent degree. The general percentage of pauper population in London was 7·9, whereas the percentage of pauper alien population was 2·4. Therefore, there was really no serious reason for the Bill on the ground of paupers being introduced. The Report of the Commission said that the alien immigrants who came into this Metropolis, though very poor, were sober, law-abiding, and industrious citizens. The hon. and gallant Member who spoke last, the protagonist of this crusade against aliens, gave the whole case away, because he said they did not really think they could prevent the landing of criminals, but they could expel them. As far as criminals were concerned, they would come in through other channels than the ordinary immigrant ship, and indeed the supporters of the measure relied not on the preventive but on the expulsive clauses. Then, in regard to overcrowding, there could be no question that even if there were no alien immigration overcrowding would exist. In the North of London, where there were avowedly no aliens, and in Lambeth, there was a greater percentage of overcrowding than in the districts where the aliens lived.

What was the real reason for this Bill? It had been avowed in the most candid manner by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham that the reason why he supported the Bill was that it was going to stop a competing factor with British labour. He was not at all sure but that, if he believed there was serious competition with British labour from the alien population, he should be disposed to assist in the passing of some measure for the purpose of protecting our working classes.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Why do you not make up your mind?

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES said his mind was convinced. What were the facts disclosed by the Commission? These facts showed that this form of competition with British labour was practically non-existent in the Metropolis. No more dishonest measure had ever been introduced in an expiring Parliament. It was intended to dupe the working classes of this country into the belief that the right hon. Gentleman was the champion and protector of British against alien labour. He objected to the Bill also because he believed that there was a serious chance of individual refugees who were fleeing from religious and political persecution being prevented from landing on what had hitherto been the free shores of England. Did the right hon. Gentleman reflect that the chief ground of the esteem and admiration felt on the Continent for Great Britain was on account of the liberty of our institutions and the right of asylum we had afforded to foreigners. Every Continental politician who had Liberal tendencies pointed with admiration to these shores as the great free commonwealth; and that right of asylum was being taken away by the Bill. There was no demand for this measure. The Labour Members were silent; the great trades unions were silent, or, if they had taken official action at all, it was to protest against the Bill. As a Radical and an Englishman he objected to the Bill; he believed it would receive the condemnation of the country; and he was fully convinced, and firmly hoped, that it would be struck off the Statute-book.

***Mr. STUART SAMUEL** (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) ventured to say that the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite had never added to the knowledge of the House on this question. The hon. and gallant Gentleman only offered his own impressions, but did not give the figures on which a Bill of this kind should rest, and he really never attempted to make out a case for the measure. The hon. and gallant Member for Stepney had indeed said that 425 houses in that borough had changed ownership since last year, but he omitted to say that the town clerk of Stepney had reported that there were 1,500 houses vacant there, and that the absence of ratepayers was becoming a serious matter for the borough. One would think from what hon. Members opposite argued that in the East End of London hordes of aliens were driving the British workman away, and putting him upon the rates, but the town clerk also reported that very day that there were no aliens in Whitechapel in receipt of Poor Law relief, whereas in Poplar, where there were no aliens, 6,000 people were receiving out-relief.

Major EVANS GORDON said that the hon. Member, when he was giving the statistics of Whitechapel, omitted to say that in that district it had been the policy of the boards of guardians for years past not to give out-relief, while in Poplar it had been the policy to extend out-relief. Besides this, the Jewish Board of Guardians in Whitechapel had contributed enormously to the relief of the foreign population.

***Mr. STUART SAMUEL** said that the hon. and gallant Gentleman had not improved his position by his interruption. The Jewish inhabitants paid their rates just the same as the British inhabitants, but they got no benefit from them. The Jews cared for their own poor.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON said that the amount of out-relief given in Whitechapel was no indication of what the alien population was.

***MR. STUART SAMUEL** said that the aliens did not receive any outdoor relief from the rates. There were a few sober facts which he wished to bring out. The total cost to the whole country for the relief of aliens last year was £29,000; and he asked how many aliens could be supported for a whole year on that sum?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT asked if the hon. Gentleman would state what the expenditure of the Jewish Board of Guardians was?

***MR. STUART SAMUEL** said that what the Jewish Board of Guardians expended was not a charge on the ratepayers of this country. His point was that the alien did not drive the British working man on to the rates. They must come back to the fact that the total cost of the aliens throughout the country last year was £29,000. He knew that the hon. and gallant Gentleman did not like these figures and studiously avoided them. When the Secretary to the Board of Trade, relying on the Board of Trade Returns, said that 75,000 aliens came to this country it was not a fair statement, as the Board of Trade Returns did not give the number of aliens who went out to other countries. From his own personal knowledge, and as a member of the Jewish Board of Guardians, he was aware that large numbers went to other countries, assisted by charitable means, and large numbers on their own initiative. The Secretary to the Board of Trade might just as well say that the Bank of England was bankrupt because it passed out so many sovereigns, if no account were taken of the sovereigns that came in. The charge of the Prime Minister that the aliens reduced the standard of living here was a difficult one to meet, and if substantiated would be a just reproach. But in St. George's-in-the-East, which had a large alien population, the birth rate was recently 52 per 1,000, or nearly double that of London, while the deaths were at the rate of 12·3 per 1,000, the lowest ever known in the district. It was not likely that such figures would be found among people living in conditions likely to reduce the standard of life. Dr. Thomas, medical officer of health for Stepney, stated in his annual report that in Stepney nearly 20 per cent. of the population were not legally married. But that estimate was only arrived at after excluding the Jews. That did not suggest that the aliens reduced the standard of living, nor did the fact that 98 per cent. was frequently the figure of school attendance, or that forty two public-houses were recently closed in his district. He could point to street after street in Whitechapel and Stepney which were formerly dens of thieves and down which in his experience policemen had been afraid to go, but which were now perfectly safe owing to the settlement of aliens there. If the Government did anything to interfere with the trade brought there by aliens they would regret it, for many British workpeople who were employed in these trades would suffer. The Bill had been announced as for the benefit of the working classes and also in relief of the Jews from burdens thrown upon them. But as the Labour Members had denounced the Bill on behalf of the working men, so he denounced it on behalf of the Jews, who desired no protection from the congenial task of succouring those not so fortunate as themselves and who did not limit their succour to people of their own race or religion. This country had a great reputation for its generosity to oppressed peoples throughout the world without regard to their religious beliefs. He suggested to the Government that this country had not altered in that respect.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT said that every one recognised the claim of the last speaker to be heard on this question, and he wished every Member had shown such moderation of tone, and assured him that the Bill was in no way directed against the ancient religion which he professed. It was in no sense an anti-Semitic Bill. He entirely dissented from the view of the hon. and learned Member for North-East Durham that there was no demand for a Bill regulating the immigration of aliens.

No subject had been more constantly before the House; and a Select Committee in 1889 called attention to the evils which existed from the non-regulation of alien immigration, and said that it was the bounden duty of the Government to take the question up. He confessed his admiration at the way the Bill had been handled by the Home Secretary. His complaint was that the Bill had been too long delayed, but he congratulated the Home Secretary for his cautious and able handling of it, and thanked the Government for persevering with it, and the First Lord of the Treasury for the energetic way in which he had brought it forward this session. A great deal had been made of the comparatively small number of aliens that came upon the rates; but the fact that a large number of our own people were deprived of their homes and means of livelihood owing to this uncontrolled foreign immigration was not taken into account.

Major SEELY said that the Committee distinctly stated that there was no proof of that.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Nothing of the kind. The Select Committee, of which he was a member, in their Report of 1889 distinctly called attention to the considerable number of our own people who were deprived of their homes and their livelihood by aliens. That was the real cause of the rise of the rates in this country. Then it was said that the Bill was imperfect, but no Bill that ever passed the House was an absolutely perfect Bill. There must be some imperfections, and to his mind one imperfection in this Bill was that it would throw a considerable cost on the people of this country, which the aliens themselves who came to this country ought to bear. In the United States every alien who gained admission had to pay a fee of two dollars to meet the expenses of the immigration department. Unfortunately there was nothing of that sort in this Bill. We could not keep out all the undesirables, but he was perfectly certain that a very great preventive measure had been passed which would make aliens hesitate before coming into this country. He thanked the Government for bringing forward the Bill, and he hoped it would soon become law.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I do not grudge the hon. and gallant Gentleman the tone of jubilation which he is able to show to the House to-night; and I only hope that a few years hence it will appear that this Bill has been as perfectly ineffective as the Prison Goods Bill, and less dangerous and injurious to the trade of this country than the Trade Marks Bill—the great measures with which his name will always be associated. The Bill before the House is one which has been greatly talked about in the country, and two great efforts have been made, last year and this, to pass some Bill of this kind into law. On the Second Reading of the Bill I was unable, with a great many others, to vote for it, although quite willing to take part in any reasonable proposal for the exclusion of those who were literally and unmistakably undesirable aliens. But I could not vote for the Bill until I saw what shape it would finally take under the manipulation of the Government and the supporters of the Government. Now, at the end of the career of the Bill, I find that there is one great fault in it, which is of itself enough to make me vote against it, as I shall. It is that the Bill is one which draws a distinction between the poor and the rich, or rather between the destitute and those who have a little money to produce when they come among us. I cannot imagine anything less in accordance with the general spirit and characteristic of our countrymen than that that should be the particular ground upon which a man is to be excluded. The hardest-working man, the most laborious and intelligent man, the man the most likely to make a good citizen, if he settles here, and to do his duty by those belonging to him and those who live around him, has no chance to come into this country unless he has money in his pocket. But the worthless man, the scamp, the lazy man, the man who is not likely to add either to the prosperity of other people or his own, can come in if he has money in his pocket. That is a plain statement of the fact, and it is quite enough to condemn this Bill.

I have no intention of detaining the House more than two or three minutes. ["Hear, hear!" from an hon. MEMBER on the GOVERNMENT Benches.] I am obliged to the hon. Member for the extremely courteous interruption. If he does not agree with me in opinion, perhaps he will get up and state his opinions, if he is in a condition to do so. Besides this cardinal sin, on account of which, if nothing else, I would condemn the Bill, there is that which has been demonstrated again and again through the course of these debates —the impracticability of the provisions of the Bill, the ridiculous results to which we are reduced when we attempt to follow out what will happen when the provisions of the Bill are brought into force. There is one thing to which my attention has been called to-day which I will mention as an instance of what I mean. Shipowners before taking a transmigrant on board ship to go to the United States or our Colonies will now in self-defence be obliged to refuse to take him on board unless he stays six months in this country, lest they should be under the necessity of maintaining him for the rest of his natural lite; so that the Bill sets a premium upon constituting in this country the residence for six months at least of the very class from foreign communities whom the measure professes to exclude. The Bill is full of absurdities of that kind. I admit that it has been improved in one important respect—namely, the treatment of the refugee. It is better, although not so complete or so clear or effective as we should have liked. Still, it is vastly improved from what it was originally. But the whole of this legislation from first to last has been faulty legislation, because it was insincere legislation, because it was known to be a mere pandering to a strong prejudice in certain limited localities in this country; and it would have been much better to have allowed the small number of real undesirables to come in rather than to create all the expense and the turmoil and the elaborate machinery, and, as I think, the contradiction to the whole tenor of the policy and the sympathies of this country throughout generations which have been created by this Bill.

The Bill will, of course, become law; that has been evident from the first. The one thing which reconciles us to it is that it will do, after all, but little harm. The very absurdity of many of its provisions and the unworkable nature of the machinery will defeat to a large extent the purpose of those who have been anxious to see it passed into law. We have not yet been made quite sure whether it is intended to be the first step in a long process of active protection. It has been claimed on that ground—[AN HON. MEMBER on the GOVERNMENT Benches: "No."] —it has been claimed on that ground by the hon. Member for West Birmingham —claimed by him as the first step in the glorious progress towards the shutting out not only of the foreigner, but of his goods. I do not think that the Government have quite openly accepted that view of their work, but so far as it tends in that direction that is an additional reason for our opposing it. But I can only express my regret that the session has been mainly devoted to such a Bill, for this is the great work of the session for which we have to curtail the opportunities of considering Supply, and for which we have to sacrifice other much more useful measures. I regret that the great work of the session has been one of such a character as not only to be likely to be of little use for the purpose for which it was intended, but also to impose upon this country a new character in the eyes of the world, a character which our fathers before us were always most anxious and careful to avoid.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The right hon. Gentleman who has just denounced the Bill tells us that his chief motive for opposing it now is to be found in the obvious insincerity and the obvious inadequacy of the clauses which it contains. Well, so far as I am aware, nothing has occurred since the Second Reading either to make the clauses less efficacious or to make the character of the Bill less sincere. But on the Second Reading the right hon. Gentleman did not take this heroic line. He did not indulge in this vein of eloquent patriotism or appeal to the shades of our forefathers. Unless my memory greatly deceives me, he and his friends took the safer course of walking out of the House, and with a great effort of self-control avoided expressing the feelings doubtless boiling in their breasts, at a time when according to the practice of the House it is most appropriate to show them. Who can tell what might have happened had the right hon. Gentleman and his friends taken this stand on the Second Reading, and, speaking for a united Party, expressed the emotions to which he had referred at half-past eleven on the last night of the Bill, when, as he truly observes, it is quite obvious that the Bill must pass into law?

There was one other, I thought very unnecessary, taunt which the right hon. Gentleman levelled against those who sit on this side of the House. He said that this Bill was protective in its character. As far as I am aware, there is nothing in any of the clauses of the Bill which is open to that objection, or that praise, whichever it be, according to the view of the particular individuals who express their opinions on the measure. As far as I know, there was only one attempt, to make this a protective measure and that was a strenuous, and an explicit attempt, and the whole of the Opposition marched into the lobby as one man to support it. I do not know, but my personal belief is that the right hon. Gentleman, who takes this rather belated occasion to denounce the Bill as a protective measure, did vote in favour of an Amendment to that Bill that was distinctly, obviously, and avowedly designed to prevent the competition of the foreign with the British working man.

Mr. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid.): I think the right hon. Gentleman is doing those of us who voted for that Amendment an unwarrantable injustice, because there was not a single attempt in the direct of protection. We simply tried to guard the introduction of foreign workmen in the case of disputes between employers and employed.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Is that free trade?

Mr. JOHN WILSON: That is entirely free trade and, in our opinion, as free-traders, we were acting in accordance with the principles of free trade and not in favour of protection.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I voted for the Amendment because I thought it was protective.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think my hon. and gallant friend was quite consistent. I do not complain of the Amendment; but the hon. Member will see on reflection that if the word protection is used in connection with this Bill it can only mean the exclusion of foreign labourers when they come in to compete with British labour. The Amendment was to exclude foreign labourers coming into this country in certain circumstances to compete with British labour, and it was for no other purpose whatever that the Amendment was moved.

Mr. JOHN WILSON: In times of strikes only.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is competition. No one who dispassionately considers the question—great as is the confusion that appears to affect controversy on the subject—can doubt that whatever protection may mean in connection with the migration of human beings, the effect of the Amendment which the hon. Gentleman opposite introduced, which the right hon. Gentleman opposite voted for, is protective and nothing but protective.

But I should be sorry that the last words spoken on this Bill should be spoken in a controversial vein; and nothing that I have to say will be of a kind really to raise personal controversy on either side of the House, however little my views may be agreed with. We have been accused on this side of the House of having unduly desired to restrict that hospitality which has for generations been extended by us to all and sundry who desire to come to our shores, whatever be their race, whatever be their religion, whatever be their politics, and whatever be their social *status*. For my own part, I altogether repudiate that view. It must be remembered that hospitality, though a virtue, is not obligatory either upon individuals or upon nations; and if you want it to be practised, either by an individual or by a nation, it is really in the highest degree desirable that it should not be abused; because the inevitable effect of its abuse is to induce restrictions, probably excessive, to be placed on the exercise of that hospitality, and to prevent what is in him who offers it a virtue and to him who receives it a great blessing and advantage. If I am any judge of the failings of nations, not only in Europe, but all over the world, one of the great and growing difficulties arises either from their excessive restrictions on hospitality to other nations or from the harsh treatment which a people like the Jews too often receive among some of the Eastern peoples of Europe. If it be, as I think it is, a genuine danger, lest we should be as restricted as, for instance, some of our Colonies are, or even lest we should put as severe limitations as the United States of America put upon immigration, or lest we should do as many Continental nations do, who, from geographical conditions, do not attempt to stay immigration, but who treat in the most abominable fashion many of those who are born within their borders——if we are to do that it is plain and, I think, expedient in the interests both of the original inhabitants of these islands and of those who desire to come to us, that we should not permit any abuses in connection with that immigration, any abuses that we can help—and that those abuses should be diminished to the utmost so that the hospitality which we shall extend in the future will be like that of the past, so that those who come among us will be accepted gladly and gratefully, and will become, as we are, citizens of a free country, and like ourselves will enjoy every advantage which that free country can give.

One hon. Gentleman whom I see opposite me, the Member for Whitechapel, made, as I think, a very undeserved attack upon me the other night in connection with the great body of co-religionists to which he belongs. I think he will admit that there is, no doubt, a danger, not, I hope, at present a great danger, but a real danger, that some of the difficulties from which the Continental nations now suffer might arise if we left this question untouched. We owe an enormous debt to the manner in which the Jewish community in Great Britain has striven to prevent anything of the kind happening. They have, with magnificent and organised generosity, done an immense amount to prevent the evils of which I speak. I do not think they are behaving with wisdom in ranging themselves in opposition to this Bill, as if we had wholly different aims from those which they have. I do not think we have. Of course, it is impossible by any system at the disposal of the Government to exercise the judicious and generous selection which they can exercise and do exercise. They, I think, repatriate large numbers. They do not welcome all of their religion who come over. They are able to say to this man, "You should return," and to another man, "We will provide for you," and to discriminate between the cases, so that the burden of the Jewish immigrant, at all events, is made as small as possible to the country into which he immigrates, and of which he ultimately becomes, no doubt, a valuable citizen. I will make a further suggestion, if they will allow me to do so. We have heard a great deal of the possibility of Jews and others—for the moment I confine myself to the Jews—coming to this country in an absolutely destitute condition, and being rejected, under this Bill, from our shores, although they were flying from religious or political persecution. Nobody desires that such a contingency should occur; and I cannot believe, and do not believe, that while the number of such immigrants is at all upon the same plane that it is at present there will ever be any difficulty in that regard. The great Jewish community, without the smallest difficulty, can see to it that no man seeking the hospitality of this country should ever be rejected from these shores. I do not know whether any change in the actual machinery which they use would be required to attain that purpose; but that it could be attained by that great organisation without difficulty I do not question at all. Whether it would be possible to deal with other nationalities in the same way it is a matter of difficulty to ascertain; but that it could be done with regard to every Jewish immigrant is, I think, plain on the face of it, and will hardly be denied by anybody.

The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down complained of this Bill because he said it was founded upon a distinction never before admitted in our legislation, a distinction between the poor and the rich, or, as he corrected himself, between those who are just above the extreme limits of poverty, and those who are not above those limits. I do not think he put it accurately. It is not the possession of wealth that is required in the immigrant, it is the possession of some means by which he can support himself and his family in this country. Now, is that either an unreasonable or a sordid distinction? Remember that every man who comes to this country immediately obtains a privilege which, so far as I know, is not enjoyed by right by the citizens of any other country in the world—namely, the right of going upon the public rates for his support. It may be true, and it is true with regard to one great community, that they take care of their own people. But, of course, we cannot, and we ought not to, deal simply with one community in this consideration; and I think it is not merely carrying sentimentality to excess, but it really is a most unstatesmanlike view to take to say that the distinction between a man who can support himself, and a man who would have to be supported by the rates is one that is either mean, or sordid, or negligent. It is not negligent and ought not to be negligent.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): Seven and sixpence makes all the difference between a cabin passage and steerage.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: This Bill will not keep out anybody, so far as I can gather, who ought not to be kept out. But that is a different proposition, and no Bill could be framed to keep out everybody. Let us be content if it keeps out a great many who ought to be kept out and does not keep out anybody who ought to be admitted; and I believe this Bill will attain that object. To what countries is it that the oppressed, whether they be the Roman Catholic of Poland or the Jew of Russia, look for happier circumstances in which to live their lives? It is to the English-speaking countries, and without any exception at present, save this country, without any exception at all after this Bill is passed, they put some restriction on immigration, and they largely base that restriction on the very consideration which is described as so mean and so contemptible by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The United States, doubtless, is not a perfect community. It has its faults like any other community. But will anybody assert that it is an ungrateful recipient of the oppressed of other nations? Will anybody assert that it is indifferent to freedom, that it looks with an unmoved eye upon the sufferings of the oppressed and the unhappy in any nation? I do not think that anybody who knows the United States, I do not think anybody who knows any community sprung from British stock and enjoying institutions derived from British sources, will allege that that is the fact. But all these nations, the homes of the oppressed by the admission of the entire civilised world, put, so far as I know, restriction on immigration; and in every case the restriction is far severer than that which is imposed by this Bill. In these circumstances, in the interests not merely of those for whom my hon. friends on this side of the House have spoken, and spoken in not too excessive terms, but in the interests of those who desire to find a home in this country, and in the interests, above all, of that spirit of equal consideration for all citizens of this land which we at present possess, and which is the heritage of so few other nations—in all these interests I would beg the House to pass this Bill. There are in this House many able representatives of the people who, either themselves, or their fathers, or their ancestors, came over and have received hospitality among us, and whom we regard, I need hardly say, as our equals in every respect, as supporters in common with us of the institutions of the country which they serve and which we serve. If ever we lose that precious heritage of an equal charity to all citizens of this country, we shall lose one of the most precious things that we now possess; and it is because I believe that a Bill like this, moderate, reasonable, and practical, will conduce to that great end that I shall certainly vote for its Third Reading.

Mr. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) said there was some language which fell from the hon. Member for Sheffield a short time ago which, he thought, ought not to be allowed to go unchallenged. He told them that the great opposition to the Bill, as judged by the Amendments on the Paper, came from that side of the House. If he would take the trouble to look at the Order Paper for the first day on which they went into Committee on the Bill—and that, he took it, was the true test as to the source from which the opposition came with reference to any Bill—he would find there were 149 Amendments, ninety-five of which stood in the name either of the Government or their supporters, and only fifty-four in the name of the Opposition, showing that there was twice as much opposition to the Bill from the Government side of the House as from his.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: How many were moved?

Mr. FENWICK said his object in intervening in the debate was simply to state the grounds, in a few words, on which he should vote against the Bill. He agreed with the hon. Member for the Isle of Wight and also with the Leader of the Opposition that there was no sincerity whatever about the Bill. The hon. Member for Sheffield maintained that there was a popular demand outside the House for it, and he agreed with him that, if that did exist, the Bill was overdue. Ten years ago the Prime Minister and every Unionist candidate put the question in the forefront of his political programme, but till now there had been no attempt to deal with it. If they were sincere in dealing with the question and if it were not merely an electioneering dodge [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] Perhaps he ought not to say "Dodge" and he would withdraw the term [Opposition cries of "No, no!"] and take one of the Prime Minister's, which was better. If it were anything more than a Parliamentary manœuvre for electioneering purposes, then, he thought, they should have had the measure before now. They could not plead that they had been too busy with other things, they had had abundance of time. He maintained that it was no more urgent to-day than it was in 1895. In all those years they had been subsidising special classes and interests; and here was a question which was of urgent public importance and in which every member of the industrial classes of the country was interested—he referred to the Workmen's Compensation Bill—to be crowded out this session in order that they might pass a measure of this kind which interested a few localities from which the Government chiefly drew their own supporters. Under these circumstances he thought they were justly entitled to enter their protest against a measure which was certainly not demanded by the working classes, and which was occupying valuable time which, in his judgment, might have been devoted to the promotion of legislation anxiously and urgently demanded on behalf of the whole of the working classes throughout the United Kingdom.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 214; Noes, 136 (Division List No. 301.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hon. SirH
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R.(Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bathurst, Hon. AllenBenjamin
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hon.SirJosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,RtHn.AilwynEdward
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Rt HnSirRB.(Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(WarwickS,W)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rHm'lets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'ndery
Hardy,Laurence(KentAshford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, SirJames(Staffords.NW
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John(KentFaversham
Hozier, Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Kennaway, Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long, Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hn SirHE.(Wigtn
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hon.J.Scott(Hants
Morgan,DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Newnes, Sir George
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick N.
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, Rt HnJParker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)

Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J.G.(Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E.(Taunton
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Aston und. Lyne)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N.E.(York, NR Whitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs)
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark N.E
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P, (Cavan, W)
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Moulton, John Fletcher
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Power Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Richards, Thomas
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C.R (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T.(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Major Seely and Mr. Trevelyan.

Main Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 193; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 302.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hon.SirH
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Balcarres Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R.(Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Buxton,SydneyCharles(Poplar)
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon.Thos.H.A.E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir JosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland Sir FredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir WilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, RtHnAilwynEdward
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, RtHn SirRB. (Inv'rn'ss
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,SW.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, SirJames(Staffords,NW
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John(KentFaversham
Hozier, Hon.James HenryCecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon.Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Kennaway, Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lee, ArthurH.(HantsFareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt.HnSirHE.(Wig'tn
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray
Murray, Charles B. Coventry
Newnes, Sir George
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, RtHnJ.Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt,HnJ.G(Oxf'dUniv.)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James

Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col. Sir CEH (Sheffield)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barry, E. (Cork, S,)
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, NE. (York, NR, Whitby
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hayden, John Patrick
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P (Cavan, W.)
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth South)
O‘Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor John (Kildare N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Richards, Thomas
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Russell T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C.R. (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Noes—Major Seely and Mr. Trevelyan.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

TRADE UNIONS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

PUBLIC MEETINGS (FACILITIES) BILL [LORDS].

Read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

TELEGRAPH (CONSTRUCTION) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

Adjourned at twenty-four minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 20*th July*, 1905.

VISCOUNT HAWARDEN.

Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of Robert Henry Viscount Hawarden, in the Peerage of Ireland, to vote at the election of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Rhondda Urban District Council Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Malvern Water Bill. The Lord Chancellor informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The order made on the 11th instant discharged, and Bill committed.

Bootle Corporation Bill; London Gas Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bills passed, and returned to the Commons.

Wigan Corporation Bill; North-East London Railway Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

London County Council (Money) Bill. Reported, without Amendment.

Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) (No. 2) Bill. Brought from the Commons and read 1^a; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 149.)

Glasgow University Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to the M'Callum Celtic Lectureship in the University of Glasgow. Was presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow; read 1^a; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Section 7), deemed to have been read 2^a; and reported from the Committee. (No. 150.)

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 16) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 17) Bill. Read 3^a (according to order), and passed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AFRICA, No. 5 (1905).

Award of His Majesty the King of Italy respecting the Western Boundary of the Barotse Kingdom (with a map).

JAPAN, No. 1 (1905).

Award of the Arbitration Tribunal appointed to pronounce on certain questions as to the interpretation of treaties with Japan with regard to leases held in perpetuity.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES.

Treasury Minute, dated 18th July, 1905, upon the recommendations of the University Colleges Committee.

NAVAL WORKS.

Memorandum showing the works upon which expenditure is proposed to be provided for under the Naval Works Bill of the present session.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3442. Turkey (Erzeroun).
No. 3443. Morocco (Dar-al-Baida).

STATISTICS.

Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1890 to 1904. Fifty-second number.

RAILWAY RETURNS.

Returns of the Capital Traffic Receipts and Working Expenditure of the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom, for the year 1904; with a general report thereon, and summary tables for a series of years.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1906.

BANKRUPTCY.

Twenty-second General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under Section 131 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNION OF BENEFICES (METROPOLIS) ACT, 1860.

Scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for effecting an union of the benefice of Saint Michael, Cornhill, in the City of London, and the benefice of Saint Peter-le-Poor with the vicarage of Saint Benet Fink annexed, and for effecting certain other measures incidental to or arising out of such union. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 146.)

ALIENS BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next. (No. 147.)

MEDICAL ACT (1886) AMENDMENT BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 148.)

DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

SHIPOWNERS' NEGLIGENCE (REMEDIES) BILL.

Amendment reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE TO CROPS BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, this is a Bill dealing with damage done to crops by railway fires, and the Bill really represents a compromise between the representatives of railway interests and agricultural interests in the other House. As your Lordships are probably aware, possibly in some instances to your own cost, no compensation can be obtained under these circumstances at present unless negligence can be proved on the part of the railway company, and this has constituted an admitted grievance for some time to the agricultural community.

As a matter of fact, it is so difficult to prove negligence with regard to these fires that people very seldom make any attempt in this direction at all, because, as I need hardly point out, it is extremely difficult in the case of a field or crop which has been burnt by a railway fire to show what particular engine caused the damage. It is almost impossible to identify the engine, and this sort of thing might happen—that a farmer who had had great trouble, but had succeeded in identifying an engine and in tracking that engine to its home, would in addition have to prove that the engine was improperly constructed, and for this purpose he would in all probability have to employ an expert, costing him a large sum per hour. The railway company probably, on the other hand, would also employ an expert, or more than one expert, at an even more expensive rate, and if the plaintiff were eventually fortunate enough to convince a jury of the justice of his case he would obtain a victory of an expensive kind, and probably would eventually feel that it would have been much wiser not to have taken any proceedings at all.

Under the Bill it is unnecessary for the aggrieved person to prove anything except that the fire was caused by a railway engine, and he is entitled under the Bill to recover up to an amount of £100. When this Bill was being discussed in the other House it was apparently viewed with unnecessary alarm by the representatives of the railway companies, who complained that it constituted an addition to the burdens which an unsympathetic Parliament was constantly placing on railway companies. I admit there is some force in this contention, because my experience in Committee-rooms upstairs has made it perfectly plain to me that railway companies do occasionally meet with somewhat harsh treatment. They have all sorts of obligations put upon them by Parliament. They have to contribute enormous sums to the rates, whereas they very often do not get any clear advantage out of that expenditure; but when the railway companies contend that on account of the benefits which they confer on an agricultural neighbourhood they should be exempt from responsibility for any damage which they may cause, I venture to think that is an unreasonable attitude for them to adopt, and I do not think it is one which will be admitted by this House.

The grievance which this Bill endeavours to remedy is an admitted grievance, and that it is a grievance is clearly shown by the fact that land which is within 100 yards of a railway has to be insured at a higher rate than land outside that limit. I think the railway companies have really made a very good bargain over this Bill. In the first place, it does not come into operation until January, 1908. Therefore, until that date railway companies can go on burning crops, trees, stocks, buildings, everything, in fact, that is combustible. After the date I have mentioned, they will still be able to go on burning practically everything, except trees and crops, and if they burn them they will in no case have to pay more than £100. Under Section 2 of the Bill the railway companies can take all reasonable precautions to prevent a fire breaking out at all, but they are unable to take these steps without the permission of the owner. They cannot, for instance, cut down or injure trees or shrubs, and they are practically limited to removing nothing except heather, grass, fern, and things of that description; and in addition they have to pay compensation in respect of losses of amenity in consequence of any operations of this nature which may be carried out.

If this Bill meets with any opposition, which I do not think probable, it may take the form that it does not go far enough; but, as I have already pointed out, it is a compromise which has been arrived at with some difficulty between the two conflicting interests in the other House. At all events it removes a grievance, not a very heavy grievance, but one which has existed for a considerable time, and affects some improvement in the situation from the agricultural standpoint. I therefore hope no opposition will be offered to the Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Newton.*)

*THE EARL OF LICHFIELD: My Lords, I should like to say one or two words in support of this Bill. The noble Lord who has just moved the Second Reading dealt with the main provisions of the Bill, which, as he said, are in the nature of a compromise between the railway companies and the agricultural interest; but what I should like to emphasise is the great importance of this subject to the agricultural community generally. I do not know any subject that has been more frequently alluded to at the various meetings of chambers of agriculture throughout the country, and I am asked on behalf of the Central Chamber of Agriculture to state that it is their earnest hope that this Bill may be passed into law. It is true that we do not obtain under this Bill all that could be desired, but it has come from the House of Commons as a compromise between the interests concerned, and, therefore, on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread, I hope your Lordships will in the agricultural interests give this Bill a Second Reading, and not alter it materially in Committee.

LORD WOLVERTON: My Lords, this Bill is, as has been stated, a compromise, and it has received the approval of my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade. It is an honourable compromise which has taken place in the other House between the agriculturists on the one side and the railway companies on the other, and I think I am entitled to say, on behalf of my right hon. friend, that during those negotiations the railway companies have behaved in a most friendly spirit. This Bill is undoubtedly a distinct advantage to the small agriculturists, and in these circumstances I am very happy to accept it on behalf of His Majesty's Government, and to offer to my noble friend, not only the support of the Government on this occasion, but their support in the future stages of the Bill, so long as it is not seriously altered in Committee.

Lord BURGHCLERE: My Lords, as has been pointed out by previous speakers, this Bill is essentially a compromise, and does not go as far as agriculturists would desire. But, on the other hand, as your Lordships know, this injury which is done to crops, and, above all, to plantations which are necessary for the afforestation of this country—this grievance has been so long before the country that as agriculturists we welcome even such a small measure as this. The whole gist of the Bill is in the first clause, which, as I understand, removes from the railway companies any statutory exemptions which they might have had hitherto, and brings the whole question of the damage under the common law. It would have been very desirable, if it had been possible, to induce the railway companies to adopt some preventive measures in their engines, either in the smoke-stacks or in the fuel, so as to prevent there being any sparks at all. I am told that in Germany, where this nuisance has been very prevalent in the past, it has practically been entirely done away with by improvements in the railway engines. The same, I believe, has taken place in Sweden, and also very successfully in Canada, where tracts of forest used to be burnt in old days in this way. But though the Bill does not go as far as agriculturists no doubt would desire, it seems to me an effectual compromise. It will benefit small cultivators of land, and therefore for my part I shall certainly strongly support the Second Reading of the Bill.

Lord NEWTON: I may inform the noble Lord that as the Bill does not come into operation until 1908, there is ample time for the railway companies to make the improvements he suggests.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) BILL. [H.L.]

[Second Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The LORD CHANCELLOR of IRELAND (Lord Ashbourne): My Lords, the object of the Bill which I now ask your Lordships to read a second time is to amend the law relating to County Courts in Ireland. It deals with many improvements which from time to time have been suggested in the administration of those Courts, and on former occasions Bills have been passed by your Lordships embodying nearly all the clauses in this Bill. I trust, therefore, that there will be no opposition to its Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION.

***The LORD BISHOP of RIPON**: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration, and to suggest further inquiry on the subject of infant mortality. The Report deals with a matter of very great importance. Perhaps I may be allowed at the outset, in calling your Lordships' attention to the Report, to say that on examination of it I feel sure that there are very few people who will not say that it betokens that the members of the Committee have shown the greatest care and every desire to be impartial in the conclusions at which they have arrived. But I think it is perhaps desirable to remind your Lordships that the Report does not in any sense pretend to be exhaustive; it does not cover the whole ground, and there are many points on which further investigation is needed. The Report itself frankly acknowledges that there is much ground which has not been covered, and, therefore, when we are considering this Report and also what further steps are to be taken there is ample reason for suggesting that inquiry and investigation should not cease with the publication of this Report.

There are certain points, too, on which I think the Report touches too lightly. In the first place there is what is said about the serious statement made in some quarters that the population of this country tends to decline, and to decline more rapidly among the intelligent classes than among the poorer and more illiterate classes. The Report calls attention to a solemn statement made by a professor on that subject, who warns us that in the development of civilisation it is a very ominous matter when the illiterate and ignorant classes tend to increase and the cultured, or at any rate intelligent, classes do not keep pace in the same degree. That statement is passed by as being an almost unsupported statement. I was surprised to notice that because that statement, or one very parallel to it, was made many years ago by Professor Marshall, who called attention to the fact that in France for a long time, in America in recent times, and lately in our own country, there was a tendency amongst the abler and intelligent body of the working classes not to have large families, and this, he said, constituted a danger. It seemed to me, therefore, that the subject was worthy of further consideration.

It has been stated by one who may be looked upon as a careful student of statistics that if all our large towns were divided into wards or districts it would be found that the birth-rate was higher in the poorer districts than it is in the more well-to-do districts. Taking one district, including Bethnal Green, Poplar, and Stepney, and adding the immense and poverty-stricken district of Bermondsey to it, and another district as including Kensington, Marylebone, Paddington, and Westminster, it is found that in one decade—1880 1890—the diminution of the birth-rate in the first, the poorer district, was only ·5, whereas in the second, or wealthier district, it was 1·9; in other words, not only was it true that the birth-rate was lower in the wealthier district, but the decline was much more rapid amongst the affluent classes. I say, therefore, there is sufficient evidence to warrant our asking that further inquiry should be made into the matter.

But I pass from that. The other point the Committee seem to me to pass over with somewhat undue lightness is the question of the relative decline of the population. When two years ago this subject was brought before us I know there were many who hesitated to accept the statement that there was any real retardation in our population. I think if anyone had a doubt then he can have no doubt now on that point. You have only to take up the 66th Report of the Registrar-General to find that every statement that was made in that debate has been abundantly borne out by statistics. This seems to me not merely a matter of national importance, but also of great Imperial importance, because this retardation of the birth-rate, this slow checking, as it were, of the strength and populous vigour of the race, is not confined to this Island. It affects all our Colonies. The diminution of the birth-rate is as strongly marked in Australia as it is anywhere, and it is equally strongly marked in certain portions of Canada.

For one moment may I ask your Lordships to consider some of the statistics put before us on the authority of the Registrar-General? We all know that the birth-rate has dropped in the last thirty years from thirty-five in 1,000 to twenty-eight; but the Registrar-General points out that in estimating the diminished birth-power of the country it is not enough that you should compare the birth-rate with the rate of population, but with those who are possible mothers; and, taking the number of women from fifteen to forty-five years of age, and comparing the birth-rate on this basis, you get the real figures of the decline of the birth force of the country. Having investigated that, what was the conclusion of the Registrar-General? He says that if the birth-rate had continued as it was some thirty years ago there would have been an addition in thirty years of 2 per cent. in the population; or, in other words, the population which to-day has shown an increase of 948,000 ought to have shown an output of 1,250,000. On his statement, therefore, you have a dead loss of 300,000.

I am quite ready to admit the statement in the Inter-departmental Report that this is a feature which is common to all European countries; but the point of importance for us is not to ask whether other nations are showing a decline in the power of birth-rate, but whether, relatively to them, we are holding our own. The diminution of birth force is represented in Norway by 4 per cent.; it is represented in Germany by 10 per cent.; it is represented in France by 14 per cent.; it is represented in the United Kingdom by 15 per cent.; it is represented in England and Wales by 17 per cent.; and it is represented in Australia by 30 per cent. We look forward sometimes to the future, and, when experts tell us that we are rapidly approaching what may be called an almost stationary population, I ask myself to what end is it that providence has put into our hands these vast territories to rule. It is easy for us to speak of the number of acres which belong to the realm of the United Kingdom; it is easy to speak of an Empire upon which the sun never sets; but surely this is a question which ought to agitate and interest our minds: Will the English-speaking people in fifty or sixty years time be able to populate, be able to direct, be able to govern, be able even to hold these great inheritances?

I only refer to that to point out more emphatically what seems to me to be a crucial point arising out of this Report. If it is true that we belong to a race which is slowly slackening in its speed and diminishing its output of power from year to year, then surely it behoves us to take care that the precious little lives entrusted to us shall have the best opportunity of surviving and becoming healthy and robust. The most important feature in the Report is that which deals with infant mortality. While there have been enormous improvements in sanitation, while medical and surgical skill have made great advances, while the adult population have received the great benefit of those advances, it remains practically true that those who have received no benefit at all are the little children who are entrusted to our care. The mortality of infants, which was 154 per 1,000 forty years ago, remains at the same figure to-day.

When one takes up that very interesting Report concerning the change which has taken place in the mortality of children arising from certain diseases, one or two features strike one as having a very strange significance as bearing on this matter. Smallpox has been nearly stamped out, except in some quarters where they have peculiar views of their own; scarlet-fever has also been greatly diminished. The same is true of bronchial affections and meningitis; and, when I ask what is the gain to infant life owing to the great improvement in medical skill, I find that among boys in the town districts there ought to be twenty-eight more lives per 1,000 and among girls twenty-three more per 1,000. That, however, is far from being the case. We who know how public-spirited, how absolutely indefatigable the doctors of this country have been in this matter, cannot say otherwise than that they ought to be honoured for what they have done. Yet, in spite of the labours of that honourable profession, not only has the gain been entirely wiped out, but the death-rate has been increased. Instead of being twenty-five per 1,000 better, we are twenty-nine per 1,000 worse.

Can we draw any inference concerning the conditions of this infant mortality? The people of this country are flocking into the towns. We have 77 per cent. of the population resident in towns. An examination of the statistics shows that Blackburn, Leicester, and Preston have a mortality of 218 per 1,000; while Dorset, Wiltshire, and Hereford have a mortality of only ninety-seven per 1,000. Here we have put graphically before us the more healthy condition of the counties as compared with the towns. The mortality in twelve months in those favoured counties amounted to ninety-seven per 1,000, whereas the mortality in the three towns to which I have referred amounted to ninety-one per 1,000 in three months; that is to say, the death-rate in three months in the towns was almost equal to the death-rate in one year in the country. These are matters which make us pause.

In towns where women are employed in mills and workshops I find that the mortality among children shows a sensible increase. A certain medical officer interested in this matter grouped together three classes of towns. In the first class he put towns where women are largely employed in mills and workshops; in the second class he put towns where women are more or less employed; and in the third class he put towns where women are seldom employed. The result was that in each of these classes the death-rate amongst children dropped considerably. Another statistician took the same class of groups and found that in towns where over 15 per cent. of the women were workers there were 155 deaths, and in towns where under 10 per cent. were workers there were only 134 deaths.

In every case where you find women working in mills there is an appreciable increase in the mortality of children. This statement has been challenged, but not, I think, in any substantial way. One medical man who challenged it only did so in the sense that he held that employment of this kind was not the sole cause which gave rise to infant mortality. We are not so foolish as to say it is the sole cause; of course there are other causes. Insanitary areas and overcrowding may cause it; but nevertheless it is our duty to consider all the causes, and everyone who investigates the case must admit that the employment of women in mills is one of them. Women who work in mills cannot nurse their children, and the substitution of artificial for natural feeding is accompanied by an increase of infant mortality—a fact which is established by statistics relating to various countries. In Norway and Sweden, where the mothers nurse their children, the death rate is from ten to thirteen per 1,000. In Middle Europe, where the mothers nurse their children, the death rate is thirteen per 1,000; but where they artificially feed them it is forty-two per 1,000, and in lower Bavaria, where few mothers feed their own children, the rate of mortality is as high as fifty per 1,000.

One of the doctors in our children's hospitals tells us that 90 per cent. of the deaths of children occur among artificially-fed children; and, therefore, when we are dealing with this question of infant mortality we have a right to ask that the conditions of women's labour should be considered. The recommendation in the Inter-departmental Report which urges that no woman should be allowed to go back to a mill to work after childbirth without a medical certificate that she is fit to do so, is surely a very wise provision. There should also be some indication or certificate that the child is being properly cared for. Allied with that is the other question which is of such great importance, the feeding of the children themselves. The Report reminds us that a great deal can be done by utilising existing machinery. That seems to me to be one of the things that ought to be impressed more and more upon the public mind.

There exist laws which many of us are perfectly unaware of, and which the public do not know. Let me give you one illustration. Take the milk supply. If the medical officers of health take care that the milk supply coming into a town is adequate and suitable a great deal of good may be affected. Much, for instance, has been done in London during the last three or four years to increase the supply of genuine milk. Whereas three or four years ago the number of cases in which genuine milk came into London was 209, last year the number was found to be 417; that is to say, through the efforts of the inspectors the supply of genuine milk had been doubled. Again, whereas there were eighty-three detected cases of adulterated milk three or four years ago, that number has dropped to thirty-five, which shows what can be done by vigilance and care. If I turn to the statistics of Brighton I find that precisely the same thing occurs there. There is also this very remarkable feature, that it is necessary to discriminate between the quality of the milk supplied in wholesale places and the quality of the milk supplied in retail establishments. Over and over again the change from genuine and useful milk to inferior milk takes place at the retail establishment. Whereas there were only 7·6 cases of adulteration in wholesale places in Brighton, there was as high a figure of adulteration as thirty-eight in the case of the retail; and it is mentioned in that Report that a certain substance, the nature of which I confess I do not know anything of, was present in seventy-seven cases where milk was bought from retail establishments, but in not one single case of milk purchased from wholesale establishments. If this substance is put in to give a fictitious appearance of freshness or creaminess to the milk it is in itself objectionable. I think the people of this country are entitled to have as pure a milk supply as can be got, and there is resident in the municipal authorities a great power for dealing with the milk supply.

The question of infant mortality is a serious one in view of the fact that our population is not growing as it once grew. When I remember that in 1859 the world deplored the carnage of 63,000 in the war between France and Austria, and that in 1866 the loss of life amounted to 51,000 in the war between Prussia and Austria; when I remember that the annual wastage of children's lives in this country is equal to more than the aggregate of these two terrific conflicts and amounts to 140,000 a year; when I remember these things I ask: Is it not time that we did something to preserve to the country these young lives which might grow up to be healthy, vigorous, and serviceable to this great Empire? Whatever we can do to establish the younger generation in number and in vigour ought most certainly to be done.

We should have ideal conceptions concerning the health of the population of this country. We ought not to be content to let things be and to allow rickets, pneumonia, and diarrhœa to destroy not merely numbers, but to enfeeble the health of those who survive; because an incalculable number of those who are weakened by being exposed to these ailments, though they survive, count as a dead loss among the physical assets of this country. Every child born should have a fair chance of life and fulness of health. Our ideal dream for the country should be that of the ancients, who desired that their oxen should be strong to labour, and that there should be no decay, no leading into captivity, and no complaining in our streets: and seeing that I believe, as I am sure your Lordships do, that all prosperity of this kind depends on lives in harmony with the Divine order, whether physical, moral, or spiritual, I may add those other words of the ancient prophet—

> "Not only happy are the people that are in such a case, but blessed are the people that have the Lord for their God."

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE, who had given notice "To ask His Majesty's Government whether they intend to take any steps to institute an anthropometric survey, with a view to the collection of definite *data* bearing upon the physical condition of the population, as recommended in the Report of the Committee on Physical Deterioration," said: My Lords, before the right rev. Prelate gave notice of his Motion and his Question I had already privately communicated to my noble friend the Lord President of the Council my wish to call attention to the Report of the Inter-departmental Committee, and to ask His Majesty's Government whether they had taken, or were contemplating taking, any steps in consequence of the Report. I am extremely glad that the attention of your Lordships' House and of the public has been called to this Report by the extremely interesting and eloquent speech of the right rev. Prelate, but I do not propose to follow any part of his observations; in the first place, because those questions to which he has devoted the whole of his observations—namely, the retardation of the birth-rate and infantile mortality—have not specially occupied my attention up to the present time; but mainly because my intention was principally to call attention to the subjects which were specially entrusted to the Committee, and neither retardation of population nor infantile mortality was amongst those which were included in the reference to the Committee.

It may be desirable that I should recall for a moment the recollection of your Lordships to the origin of the appointment of this Committee. It arose from a discussion which took place in this House now more than two years ago, when the noble Earl on the Cross Benches (the Earl of Meath) drew the attention of the Government to the Report of the Royal Commission on Physical Training in Scotland, and to the Report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting for 1902, and asked the Government whether they would be prepared to issue a Royal Commission, or a Committee of inquiry, with a view to ascertaining whether the poorer populations in our large towns are exposed to conditions which, if continued, must inevitably contribute to a low national standard of physical health and strength, seeing that if such be the case it would constitute a grave national peril. As a member of the Government at that time and Leader of the Government in your Lordships' House it was my duty to reply to the noble Earl; and while I did not for a moment seek to minimise the importance of the figures and facts which he brought before us, I had to state, on behalf of the Government, that we did not think that there would be any advantage in the immediate appointment of a Royal Commission, at all events until the scope of the inquiry and the terms of reference which should be made for such an inquiry had been carefully considered. I did undertake, however, at the same time that this important subject should not be lost sight of by the Government, and I added, after consultation with other members of the Government, these words—

"What my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War and the Home Secretary propose to do is to consult on these subjects, in the first instance, the medical profession through the Councils of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons. They propose to consult with them as to the best means of obtaining information, not so much as to the extent but—what appears to us to be much more important—as to the causes of this undoubted physical deficiency existing in some parts of the population, and as to the best means of remedying these deficiencies and of improving the national health and strength."

After some further consideration it appeared to us that this pledge might best be carried out by the appointment of a Departmental Committee, the reference to which your Lordships will find on the first page of the Report. That reference I do not think I need read now. It was extended shortly after the first appointment of the Committee; it covered somewhat more than I had promised, but it was not directed to extend its inquiries to those interesting subjects which have been referred to by the right rev. Prelate.

I give this short account of the origin of this Committee in order to show that the Government were fully responsible for its appointment, and although they are, of course, not responsible for any of its recommendations, they are still, I think, committed by what I stated on behalf of the Government two years ago, that they did not intend to lose sight of this important subject; and I trust that we shall hear from my noble friend that the Government have given to the recommendations of the Committee, for the appointment of which they were responsible, all the attention which they deserve. I trust also that they may be able in some respects to act upon them. This Report has now been for some time before the House, and I believe it is universally admitted to be a Report of very great value. It has not yet, I regret to say, received on the part either of Parliament or of the public all the attention which I think it deserves, but it has already excited a very considerable amount of attention on the part of a large number of those who are interested in the various social questions with which it deals.

The Report, I think, may be considered satisfactory in so far as the Committee are able to say that the alarming statements and statistics placed before them as to the percentage of rejections of recruits offering themselves for the Army and Navy, and the other evidence placed before them, did not support the belief that progressive physical deterioration of the population was going on. They were obliged, however, to add that they were not insensible to much that was grave in the state of things disclosed, and that proceeded to point out the steps by which the

Government, Parliament, and the country might be furnished with periodical *data* for forming an accurate estimate of the health and physique of the people. It is only this part of their recommendations upon which I propose to trouble your Lordships with a few observations.

The Committee made a large number of suggestions as to the direction in which remedial measures might be taken either by legislation or to a much greater degree by administration, either by Departments of the Government or by local authorities. But I find throughout the Report repeated expressions of their conviction that the first requisite of all is that more accurate information, more accurate knowledge of the facts relating to the health and physical condition of the people than is at present available should be obtained. I will read to your Lordships two or three of the paragraphs which specially refer to this point. The first paragraphs I will read are paragraphs 40 and 41—

> "It appeared to them that the machinery of the ordinary type of Royal Commission was both unsuitable and inadequate; it has been seen that there are not sufficient facts obtainable from the labours of past investigators to be made the subject of comparison with any that a Royal Commission might elicit, and its *modus operandi* would be both slow and costly. What seems to be wanted is some permanent organisation, not necessarily on a large or expensive scale, which, under expert direction, and in collaboration with all the Departments of State concerned, shall be charged with the duty of collecting and tabulating facts which throw light upon the situation, and thus provide means by which those interested in the subject may at any moment satisfy themselves of the progress of the nation one way or another.
>
> "Every witness who was examined on the subject testified to the great value of such facts in determining questions relative to the physique of the people. Though opinions differed as to the amount and method of observation necessary, it was admitted on all hands that anthropometric records were the only accredited tests available, and that if collected on a sufficient scale they would constitute the supreme criterion of physical deterioration or the reverse. It was also held that the school population and the classes coming under the administration of the Factory Acts offered ready material for the immediate application of any system that might be devised."

I think the only other paragraph that I need read is one in which, after examining the details of a scheme which had been submitted to them by, I think, Professor Cunningham, the Committee state—

> "Without pledging themselves to an approval of the plan proposed in all its details the Committee are emphatic in recommending the creation of an organisation on the lines indicated; and regard it of the highest importance towards the collection of authoritive information on the subject of the present inquiry that the survey should be undertaken at the earliest possible moment."

Your Lordships will see that the Committee did not commit themselves to the details of any particular plan, and I need hardly say that I am not prepared to do so either. The details of any such plan can only be worked out by the experts of the various Departments concerned, but I do not think that anybody who will examine the plan which was laid before the Committee and their description of it, can entertain the smallest doubt that such a survey is capable of being instituted without any extraordinary amount of difficulty and without necessarily involving any large amount of expense.

As I have said, this Report has received a good deal of attention from those interested in the subjects which it discusses. A very weighty memorial has, I am informed, been presented to my noble friend by the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, in which they express their warmest approval of the Report, and state in one or two sentences which seem to me so exactly apposite the advantages which may be expected from the institution of such a survey as has been recommended by the Committee, that I think I may be allowed to read a very short extract from their memorial. They state that—

> "Without a continuous physical record of the people we cannot tell with certainty whether physical deterioration has taken place, or its extent, nor can we determine the conditions which influence the physical development of the population. Until these conditions are determined no remedies can be applied intelligently. It is estimated that the cost of an anthropological survey would not be greater than that of the geological survey, and a survey of the geology of the country, however useful, cannot be of greater value to the State than a survey of the physical condition of the people themselves."

It is important that we should endeavour to get at these facts. It is not a question merely of deterioration;

it is a much larger question than that. It is the question of the physical unfitness of a certain considerable portion of the population—the unfitness which possibly arises to a large extent from preventable causes; the question of the extent to which this unfitness prevails, and of the possibility of measures which might remedy it.

I think, my Lords, that in the discussions which have already taken place on this subject there has been some little confusion in consequence of the somewhat lax use of the words "deterioration" and "degeneration," a laxity which has, I am afraid, not been altogether removed by the instructions which were given to the Committee or by the terms of the Report of the Committee itself. Those terms appear to imply the idea that the physical condition of the people is becoming progressively worse. As I have pointed out, the Committee do not consider that that allegation is established; at all events, it is not proved. But the fact that no progressive deterioration is going on is not inconsistent with a state of things under which an increasing proportion of our population may be subject to conditions which have always existed and have always produced a certain amount of unfitness. For instance, a careful inquiry might possibly show that the physical condition of the slum population of our large cities was actually improving, and yet at the same time might show that owing to the migration of large numbers of people from the country to the towns, a larger proportion than formerly were now living under conditions unfavourable to their health and strength, and certainly there is nothing in the Report which precludes the existence of such a state of things.

This point was, I think, most effectively brought out by the evidence of Sir William Taylor, the Director-General of the Army Medical Service, which is quoted by the Committee in the second page of their Report—

"Sir William Taylor expressed the opinion that the idea of 'progressive physical deterioration' had occupied a much too prominent position in the minds of those who had had to consider and report as to the advisability of inquiry. The Director-General went on to say:—'Whether or not there has been, or is, progressive physical deterioration among the classes now in question is a matter of very great importance, no doubt; but, in my opinion, it is not the chief question from a practical standpoint. To my mind the principal question for the Committee is to inquire into the causes and present extent of the physical unfitness that undoubtedly exists in a large degree among certain classes of the population. The question dealt with in my original memorandum was not that there was evidence of progressive physical deterioration of the race, either in whole or in part, but that it is a most disturbing fact that from 40 to 60 per cent. of the men who present themselves for enlistment are found to be physically unfit for military service. Even if the proportion is no greater than in the past, surely it is a state of matters worthy of the closest investigation, and one which no thinking man can wish to see continue. Moreover, it would be out of keeping with the progressive spirit of the times we live in for us to be content with the consolation that we are no worse off than we were fifty or even twenty years ago. I trust that the inquiry may end in suggestions that will lead to the institution of measures which will result in bringing about a marked improvement of the physique of the classes from which our recruits are at present drawn.'"

I do not think any of us will dissent from the views thus expressed by the Director-General of the Army Medical Service, and whether it be a progressive, or a stationary, or a diminishing evil, no time ought to be lost in putting a stop, if a stop can be put, to such unfitness as may be shown to exist among our people.

The Committee have indicated in very considerable detail a large number of measures which they think would tend to the improvement of the physical condition of the people. They are summarised in more than fifty recommendations which are to be found at the conclusion of the Report. I have, of course, no intention of going into any of those recommendations to-day; but they deal with such subjects as overcrowding in our cities, the preservation or provision of open spaces, the prevention of smoke pollution of the atmosphere, the enforcement of responsibility of urban and rural authorities, the medical inspection of factories and workshops, the feeding of school children, rural housing, and allotments, instruction in elementary schools in cookery and other health subjects, the milk supply,—which has been referred to by the right rev. Prelate—health associations, physical exercises in schools, and for boys and girls after school age clubs and cadet corps. Some of these recommendations, no doubt, would involve legislation; but by far the greater number of them, as has been pointed out by the Bishop of Ripon, might be carried out by more active administration on the part of Government Departments, and a still larger part by more active and energetic administration on the part of local authorities. It is certain that we shall obtain on the part of those authorities neither the energy to make use of the powers which they already possess, nor the capacity of using those powers wisely and usefully, without more accurate knowledge than we now possess of the extent and nature of the evils which have been dealt with.

The advantage of the knowledge of such facts as could be obtained by such a survey as has been suggested by the Committee is demonstrated by an instance of this kind. If a careful survey were to show that a striking difference between the physical condition of populations of certain large towns and districts living under very similar conditions existed, and if that could at the same time be traced to differences of administration on the part of the local authorities, there could be no doubt whatever that when public attention was called to such facts pressure would soon be applied by public opinion to those local authorities whose administration might appear to have been lax. At all events, there is no subject, in my opinion, from the point of view either of our military or industrial efficiency, on which it is more desirable, and I may say more essential, that all the knowledge should be acquired which can be acquired by systematic and scientific inquiry; and I trust that His Majesty's Government may be able to assure us that they are giving their attention to the important recommendations of this Report, and will be able to state what measures they contemplate taking upon them [illegible]

[illegible]

*The Earl of MEATH rose "To ask His Majesty's Government whether they had taken steps, or proposed to take steps to act upon any of the recommendations mentioned in the Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Physical Deterioration; and, if so, upon which recommendations they had acted, or proposed to act, and what steps they had taken, or proposed to take, in order to carry them into action."

The noble Earl said: My Lords, although it is true, as the noble Duke has just informed you, that I was responsible for bringing to the knowledge of your Lordships on July 6th, 1903, the subject which is under discussion to-day, still I doubt whether I should have intervened in this debate had I not seen from the Notice Paper that the right rev. Prelate and the noble Duke were about to touch upon certain specific points mentioned in the Report. As the noble Duke has told you, there are over fifty recommendations made by the Interdepartmental Committee, and a good many of those recommendations were of such very great importance that I should have been sorry if any Answer had been given from the Front Bench alluding only to the subjects mentioned in the notices standing in the names of the Bishop of Ripon and the noble Duke. I hoped, by putting down the notice on the Paper which is in my name, to draw the attention of His Majesty's Government, not only to the most important subjects already referred to, but to the others upon which the Committee submitted recommendations, in the hope not only that His Majesty's Government would consider very carefully what could be done in the matter, but that the whole subject might be thought over by the public outside.

I fully agree with the noble Duke when he says that this question is a larger one than that of the deterioration of the people. In fact, I do not know who is responsible for the title of the Report. As far as the right rev. Prelate, who seconded my Motion two years ago, is concerned, and as far as I am concerned, we did not, in the speeches we made, allude to the subject of the deterioration of physique as a progressive one and as a general one. What we said—at all events what I said—has already been quoted by the noble Duke. I asked His Majesty's Government whether they would be prepared to issue a Royal Commission or a Committee of inquiry with a view of ascertaining whether the poorer populations in our large towns are exposed to conditions which, if continued, must inevitably contribute to a low national standard of physical health and strength; and I went on to say—

> "I do not contend that physical deterioration is taking place among all classes in this country, nor, indeed, that any class is actually deteriorating, for the exact reverse is certainly the case in regard to some sections of society."

And further on I said—

> "Nor do I even assert that degeneration has taken place among the poorer classes in either town or country. What I desire to emphasise is that even should it be proved that the average individual member of a poor town population is physically the equal or even slightly the superior of his poor town predecessor, the overwhelming increase which has taken place in recent years in the numbers of poor men and women who live in towns has completely altered the physical condition of England, and turned a negligible national defect into one of the most serious gravity."

That will at once be apparent to your Lordships when you consider that the urban population of England at this moment is 77 per cent., and that of Scotland 75·6 per cent. What I desire to-day is to ask His Majesty's Government whether they have taken steps, or propose to take steps, to act upon any of the recommendations mentioned in the Report of this Committee, and, if so, upon what recommendations they have acted or propose to act, and what steps they have taken or propose to take in order to carry them into action. Excluding the subjects on which information has been requested by the right rev. Prelate and the noble Duke, the principal headings under which recommendations have been made are, first of all, a "register of sickness," not only for infectious cases but for non-infectious cases. Another very important recommendation is that of the appointment of an advisory council, which should advise His Majesty's Government and any Department interested in regard to the physical well-being of the people. In France there is already such an advisory council, which is called the *Comité Consultatif d'hygiene*. Another subject of great importance is building and open spaces. I have served for some six years on the London County Council, and I do not think there was any subject in connection with which I found greater difficulty to know what was the wisest action to take than the question first of all of pulling down slum areas, and then rebuilding on those areas. Often and often I have been terribly puzzled to know what was the proper course to take. In many cases it really seemed as if there was hardly any difference, and that in either case evils must occur. The same feelings permeated many of those who acted with me, and we should have been exceedingly pleased if we could have had some sympathetic guidance and direction, and even information in regard to what had been done elsewhere, and what could and might be done.

Taking the local authorities throughout the country, I think those of your Lordships who come into contact with them must feel that there is an immense amount of ignorance in regard to the actual condition of the law, and even on the magisterial bench I have met with ignorance in regard to the statute law of these realms. Magistrates do not always know their powers, and local authorities do not always know their powers; and I cannot help thinking that the recommendations which have been made in this Report, that the Local Government Board should take a more active, sympathetic, and instructive part in enlightening local authorities in regard to their powers and duties, and the most advisable course they should take, are so important that they should receive ample consideration.

Another subject mentioned is that of smoke pollution. I have taken some interest in that subject in the Metropolis, and know that there has been a great improvement. Perhaps your Lordships may not think that is so, but I can assure you that there has been a great improvement in regard to smoke pollution in London in the last few years owing to the fact that the London County Council have had powers by which the local bodies who are unwilling occasionally to act owing to local influences are compelled to do so and fined; at all events, they are fined in this sense, that the London County Council has the power of putting the law into force and of making them pay for it. That is a case, not of ignorance, but of local influence, which prevents the local authority from doing its duty. Then, again, the Commissioners recommend that legislation should strengthen the hands of those who have to carry out the law in regard to smoke pollution.

Another very important subject which has been mentioned is that of the keeping of a register of the owners of houses. Now, this is a most important matter. If we could obtain an accurate register of the owners of houses, a great many social questions not necessary for me to enter into now would be solved. One of the great difficulties met with by all social reformers is that of knowing to whom property and houses belong, who is responsible and who is not; and it appears to me that it would not be such a very difficult thing for the Legislature to insist upon an accurate register being kept of the owners of houses.

Important also is the recommendation with regard to medical officers of health. It must often have come to the knowledge of your Lordships that medical officers of health are unable to act up to their consciences. They are removable by the very authorities that they ought to be able to direct by advice, and if they advise those authorities contrary to the interests of certain of the members, they know quite well that their tenure of office will be a very short one. Therefore the Committee, to my mind, very wisely recommend that these medical officers should be irremovable except by the Local Government Board. Another important subject is the medical inspection of factories. The Committee desire that the power of certifying surgeons should be extended so that they should be able to examine employees as regards their health beyond the age of sixteen, and that there should be co-operation between the inspectors of factories and medical officers of health, so that there should be no clashing of powers.

A subject of perhaps even greater importance than any I have mentioned is that of over-fatigue. The Committee recommend that a scientific inquiry should be made into the question of over-fatigue of workers in this country. I believe a great many more women lose their health through over-fatigue than is at all known to your Lordships, and, if so, legislation ought to be passed preventing women from working during the times before and after child-birth. You may say there is legislation. There is legislation to a certain extent, but it is legislation that is not carried out and which requires strengthening. Coal mines are mentioned by the Committee. They think that the medical examination of young persons should be extended to coalmines and workshops. Employment should be dependent on a medical certificate. If a medical certificate is required in the case of factories, why should there not be a similar certificate required in the case of workshops?

Then comes the question of alcoholism. Can any question be more important than that? The Committee ask for more scientific training of teachers in the laws of health. Next comes the question of education in rural schools. I am sure your Lordships will agree with me when I say that the education in rural schools at the present time is not what it ought to be, and there are many reasons why it is not. One reason I dare say has not struck many of you. It is that large numbers of the teachers in these rural schools come from the towns and know absolutely nothing about the country and care less; and when they are asked to teach the children country subjects and give them an interest in country pursuits they are absolutely at sea. I am not here to say how the remedy is to be found, but the Committee distinctly say that some steps should be taken to combat the influences which lead to the influx into the towns of the population from the country. I am persuaded that one of those influences is the fact that we have teachers in our country districts who are not in sympathy and in touch with the rural population.

Many of your Lordships last year were thinking over the question of rural housing, and I do hope that something will be done to prevent by-laws being made by local authorities which are absolutely absurd in regard to rural districts. Rural districts and town districts are completely different, and it is ridiculous that we who live in the country should be forced to build houses which are very suitable, no doubt, for the centre of London, but which are absolutely out of place when situated in country districts. Food and cookery is another most important subject, and there the Committee recommend compulsory continuation classes. I hope His Majesty's Government will not be afraid of the word compulsory. If we are to keep pace with the nations of the world we must compel our children to learn those things which are absolutely necessary to keep us in the forefront of the race of nations. Our girls should be taught how to prepare food and how to cook it. An admirable address was given the other day by Mrs. Flora Steele on this very subject, and she named the girls who ought to be learning these subjects, but who are not doing so, "Tam o'Shanter girls." She said she advertised the other day for a carpenter at 18s. a week and for a kitchenmaid at 17s. 9½d. a week, and received 120 applications for the position of carpenter, and not one single application for that of kitchenmaid; and yet she knows, and we all know, that if you travel about the country you meet large numbers of these "Tam o'Shanter" girls doing nothing for their living but simply amusing themselves. Then there is the question of adulteration. I shall not go into that, for it has already been touched upon.

With regard to medical certificates of death, the Committee recommend that these certificates should be confidential, and should be sent by the local registrar to the Registrar-General. I need not dwell upon that. The object must be apparent to all of your Lordships. Then with regard to the feeding of infants; what, I ask, can be more important than the training of mothers in this respect? Cannot the Local Government Board do something to encourage local authorities and direct them as to how this important subject is to be taught. Physical exercises, open spaces, gymnasia, clubs, cadet corps—in regard to all these local authorities want information and guidance; and I hope His Majesty's Government will do what they can to give them that guidance.

Lastly, the Committee recommend that some legislation should be passed in regard to juvenile smoking. I do hope that a Bill will next year be brought in by His Majesty's Government to prevent cigarette smoking by young boys. If there is one thing that all medical authorities are agreed upon more than any other it is that cigarette smoking is destructive of the health of young boys, and I do hope something in that line will be done. I have only drawn your Lordships' attention to a very few of the recommendations of the Committee. I repeat that local authorities need information and guidance in regard to the powers which they possess, and they should be shown what is wise and proper to be done.

LORD SHUTTLEWORTH: My Lords, all who have read and taken interest in the admirable Report which is under discussion to-day rejoice that the three Members of your Lordships' House who have spoken to-night have taken up this subject. I think if anything was needed to show how wide and large is the subject which we are discussing it would be the speech of the noble Earl who has just sat down, who has dealt with an enormous number of points, many of them of very great importance. Whilst I am extremely anxious to support the recommendation of the Committee as to an anthropometric survey, which is certainly a matter of the urgency which the noble Duke has described, I desire more particularly to call attention to certain other points on which it seems to me there is equal need for immediate action—points on which we have information of so startling a character that steps should be taken as soon as possible.

I shall confine myself almost entirely to the subject which was touched upon with so much eloquence by the right rev. Prelate in the latter part of his speech. Living as I do in Lancashire, among a great manufacturing population and with one of the great manufacturing towns which has been the subject of special inquiry in this Report at my doors, I cannot help having two matters brought constantly under my notice, both largely due to the same causes—I mean the heavy infant mortality in certain great towns of England and Scotland, and the enfeebled and unsatisfactory state in which a large part of our young population grow up. In the Report which is before your Lordships, and which we are discussing to-day, the causes of both these evils are shown to be largely neglect or improper feeding, or nursing out in infancy—the want, in fact, of intelligent mothering of the children. One of the causes of this is the work of the mother, and another is the nature of the home. Slums, back-to-back houses, cellar dwellings, and bad sanitation unfortunately still exist, and the statistics are perfectly appalling.

I have here, but I will not trouble your Lordships with them, statistics from thirty-three large towns for ten years, and I am sorry to say that the statistics as to infant mortality of four of our great Lancashire towns—Preston, Burnley, Salford, and Blackburn—are specially terrible. Take Burnley. I cannot help taking Burnley because it is a town immediately close to my own home; and I should like to say, at the outset, that nothing impresses me more than the extreme desire of all the authorities in Burnley to cope with and improve this state of things. I shall presently venture to suggest that they might have more help than they now receive. I am not imputing any blame; I am only suggesting that for the future, in meeting this terrific problem, this fearful state of things, they do need and would welcome aid from the central authority. In the last ten years, out of every hundred children born in Burnley twenty-one died in the first year of life. That is the average for ten years, and I am sorry to say that the evidence is that this is not getting better; if anything, it is getting rather worse. I am not speaking of the present year, about which the corporation are hopeful that certain measures they have taken are producing an impression; but taking 1904, 232·7 was the death-rate out of every thousand children in the first year of their life.

In Burnley I can myself bear witness to the fact that there has been a great advance in sanitation. The general death-rate has been much improved in recent years, but it is reported to the town council that the mortality among infants is as high as it was fifty years ago. It would take a long time to go

Lord Shuttleworth.

into all the causes, but two causes seem to stand out. The first is that in the case of working mothers too short an interval is allowed at the time of confinement. The second is ignorance; and, if we are disposed to blame the mothers for their ignorance, I think we ought to remember that Parliament itself has a responsibility in this matter. Why are these mothers ignorant? Has every step been taken that might have been taken in the schools and by other means to bring the knowledge of how to feed infants to the young women of this country? One fact comes out very clearly in this Report and in the evidence which was taken by the Committee, and that is the great desire of the mothers to learn. No doubt that desire is stronger at the moment the woman becomes a mother, and when the health visitor can get at her in time the difficulty of persuading and instructing her is not great. She is willing to learn, willing to adopt the measures recommended to her by a sympathetic and kindly woman, an official employed by the corporation, if only that information reaches her in time.

Here is a very great difficulty on which I shall wish to say something in a moment; but I can illustrate the fact that they are willing to learn by a recent report of one of the ladies who acts as health visitor in Burnley. She says—

> "It is generally on our first visit that we find the mother giving the baby 'just what we have ourselves'—meat, bacon, potatoes, and even beer and whisky. I hope this will soon be unheard of in Burnley."

Then she says, with regard to the feeding of children—

> "I am pleased to say many of the mothers are now following our advice and giving the babies nothing but milk for the first ten or twelve months. This is the result of our constant visits and a great amount of persuasion."

I may illustrate the lack of knowledge which prevails on this subject among the people by a short quotation from the health visitor's report. Speaking of the ignorance which still prevails in the poorer parts of the town in regard to storage she says—

> "It is a common practice for people to keep milk on the sink, and bread under the sink to keep it moist."

These extracts bring home to one's mind the depth of the ignorance which exists among these poor people, and we are told by the reports that they are perfectly willing to learn, and it is on the first visit of the health visitor that she finds these terrible conditions.

This brings me to one of the greatest difficulties in the way of the health visitors. They cannot get sufficiently early news of the birth of a child. The law requires registration within six weeks, and very often the birth and the death are registered at the same time. The health visitor becomes aware of the birth of an infant at the same time as she becomes aware of its death. Registration is generally postponed until very near the end of the six weeks, and information six weeks old is too late to be of use to those who try to induce the mothers to take better care of their infants. What the authorities and their health visitors desire is that in some way or other they should get much earlier information of the birth of a child. Interesting experiments are being made at Glasgow, and will shortly be made at Huddersfield, on this subject. The Glasgow authorities are offering, and the Huddersfield authorities are about to offer, a shilling reward to anyone who will bring to the authorities the earliest possible information of the birth of a child, and we shall watch with considerable interest the result of that experiment. The first suggestion I want to offer is this, whether the present six weeks for registration is not an antiquated system, and whether there is any real reason for leaving so long an interval as six weeks. It seems to me that we might supersede with advantage that system by compelling registration at a much earlier date.

But while I make that suggestion I should not like to be misunderstood. I do not think that that would have any appreciable effect upon saving the lives of children. Unless very much earlier information can be obtained by those who visit the home and use their influence on the parents, the saving of life in the case of these young infants will not be very great. What the Mayor of Huddersfield suggests very strongly, is—and he has paid special attention to this subject—that there should be compulsory notification to the health office or sanitary authority of the birth of each child within two days, very much on the same lines as infectious disease is notified. There does not seem any special reason why, if notification of infectious disease is insisted upon at the earliest possible moment, there should not be similar insistence upon notice of the birth of a child, especially as we have before us these appalling facts as to the early death of infants, for the deaths occur, to a large extent, among infants in the first week of their lives.

Another experiment is being made at Huddersfield, which I think will interest your Lordships. The mayor, by a private scheme of his own, has started a system of offering £1 as a sort of prize to every parent who can produce a child after a certain date that has lived one year. There are now seventy-four on his list which have been born since he made the offer. He writes to me that he is more than satisfied with the result so far. One result is that he hears of the birth of a child at once in most cases. Then there comes the opportunity of doing good; and, moreover, the mother is profoundly grateful. The curious feature of this scheme is that when he comes upon a mother who is on his list she expresses great delight because the mayor has interested himself in her baby. With earlier information still better results can be obtained.

I have spoken of the fact that mothers are ready and anxious to receive instruction and guidance with respect to their infants. Local willingness for guidance, however, does not end here. I am satisfied that the local authorities themselves would welcome such information as could be afforded to them by the central authority. In the Report there is a valuable suggestion on page 24, paragraphs 120 and 121—I will not trouble your Lordships by reading them—that on evidence of some abnormal state of things as regards health, such as this tremendous infant mortality, the Local Government Board might intervene. There are many analogies for such intervention. Local inquiries are held on certain subjects when there seems to be need of them. Surely there could be no stronger reason for a local inquiry than when it is shown that for two or three or more years an exceptional death-rate is prevalent, especially among infants.

The Local Government Board are constantly giving guidance which is welcomed—I can speak from my own experience of how much it is welcomed—to boards of guardians. Their inspectors go down, sit with the boards of guardians frequently, and give them guidance on important matters with which they have to deal. I venture to suggest that the time has come when similar guidance is needed, and would be welcomed by the local authorities—the other great bodies with which the Local Government Board have to deal—on health matters. I would like to ask whether that subject has been deliberated by the Local Government Board, and whether they have considered the issue of a statement such as is suggested in paragraph 136 of the Report. In that paragraph the Committee say—

> "Nothing has been brought more prominently to the notice of the Committee than the ignorance that prevails, even in quarters that ought to be well informed, as to what the law and the powers it confers are. A statement on this subject was prepared for the information of the Committee, with the assistance of the Local Government Board; and it appears to them that the Board could not do better than issue it, with such additions as they think proper, to all local authorities."

There is another suggestion to which I should like to call attention on page 59, paragraph 302. After giving facts as to conditions attending the life of the juvenile population, infant mortality, employment of mothers, and improper feeding, the Committee suggest various remedial measures. They say—

> "The Committee desire to press these considerations with all the earnestness at their command upon the most serious attention of the community, and they would further suggest to the Local Government Board the desirability of issuing to local authorities a circular explaining the objects to be sought and the means by which they can best be attained.

I do not know, and I should like to ask, whether this recommendation has been carried out.

There are two other points to which I should like very briefly to refer. The statistics show that a large number of the deaths of infants are due to premature birth. I am speaking particularly of the manufacturing towns. The right rev. Prelate referred to this subject in a very pointed way, and, therefore, I need only mention it shortly; but where a large proportion of women work in mills a terrible number of deaths are reported as following on premature births, and that surely affords a strong argument in favour of the contention that women should, as far as possible, be prevented from working during the last weeks before confinement as well as after. It is a subject, I admit, full of difficulty; it requires careful consideration, and we have not the full facts before us. I am struck with the mention in the Report that it is a defect in our law that there is no registration of still-births, and until we know fully about the still-births we shall not fully know what are the consequences which flow from the over-fatigue of women employed in factories. I should like to ask what is the view of the Government on this question of restricting women's labour before confinement, and also on the question of registering still-births.

There is one other point closely connected with the last, and that is as to the law to prevent women working in factories within twenty-eight days after confinement. If noble Lords will turn to paragraph 252, page 47, they will find these words—

> "The existing law requires that no occupier of a factory shall knowingly allow a woman to be employed within four weeks after she has given birth to a child. Thus no legal offence arises unless the occupier, with a full knowledge of the facts, is yet responsible for the employment, a situation which, in the ordinary conditions attending factory labour, it is almost impossible to prove. It is needless to say that in these circumstances prosecutions are infrequent or abortive, and though there may be a pretty uniform observation of the law, cases in which it is broken are numerous in some districts, amounting, it is thought, to general evasion.

It is often objected, when it is proposed to strengthen the factory laws in any particular, that it is unfair because other countries are not under such severe factory laws. In this particular we impose less restriction than is imposed efficiently in many other countries. In Switzerland there is a very much stronger law than in this country, and in Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Germany, and Austria there are apparently efficient laws in force to oblige women not to work too soon after their confinement. I fear that this is a point on which further legislation is needed. The other points I have touched upon can apparently be dealt with by administration. I thank your Lordships for listening to these observations, and I venture to express an earnest hope that the Report of the Committee on Physical Deterioration will receive the attention it deserves and will lead to wise administrative and legislative action.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, I am sure your Lordships will agree with me that we have had four extremely interesting speeches, and speeches of a most practical and earnest character. The right rev. Prelate, whose eloquence in opening the debate we all admired, was followed by my noble friend and predecessor the late Lord President of the Council, who with perfect justice asked whether the Government intended to take any steps to carry out an important recommendation in the Report of the Committee on Physical Deterioration which he was responsible for appointing. The noble Duke explained to your Lordships the reasons which induced him to appoint that Committee. He told you it was due, in the first instance, to the Report of the Royal Commision appointed to examine into these matters in Scotland, and he also stated that he was strengthened in his determination to appoint this Committee by the speeches of the right rev. Prelate and my noble friend Lord Meath, who has delivered to-night a practical speech ranging over a great amount of ground.

The Inter-departmental Committee was appointed in fulfilment of the noble Duke's pledge to consult the various Departments concerned. It was appointed—

> "To consider in what manner the medical profession can best be consulted on the subject with a view to the appointment of a Royal Commission, and the terms of reference to such a Commission, if appointed."

Those were the original terms of reference which were given to the Committee appointed by my noble friend after his statement in your Lordships' House two years ago. That part of the terms of reference, however, has never been alluded to in the Report. There is no recommendation with regard to the appointment of a Royal Commission, or the terms of reference to a Commission, if appointed. That omission was due to an extension of the original terms of reference, which extension practically gave to the Fitzroy Committee such terms of reference as would have been given to a Royal Commission had such a Royal Commission been appointed on the recommendation of the Committee set up by the noble Duke. I have no doubt the noble Duke will tell you if he was responsible for the alteration of those terms of reference. I am bound to say that I am a little hazy on the point. I think they were settled either at the conclusion of the noble Duke's term of office, or almost immediately on my succeeding him. At any rate, the difference in point of time is so small that in all probability the noble Duke will say that he had made up his mind on the matter before he resigned the office to which I succeeded.

The noble Duke has put very clearly before your Lordships, both in the Questions on the Paper and in the speech he has delivered, what he desires to know from His Majesty's Government with regard to the action they have taken in reference to the recommendations of the Committee which he appointed. I hope I shall be able to show the noble Duke that we have given that attention—I think "attention" is the word he used—to some of the recommendations which they deserve and which undoubtedly he was anxious they should receive. He laid great stress on the question of the anthropometric survey. The noble Duke asked us what we were doing in regard to that recommendation. There are certain difficulties in connection with the carrying out of such recommendations which I hope to explain to your Lordships before I resume my seat.

On page 84, paragraph 423, the Fitzroy Committee state—

> "With a view to the collection of definite *data* bearing upon the physical condition of the

population, the Committee think that a permanent anthropometric survey should be organised as speedily as possible upon the lines indicated in Part I. of the Report. In the first instance this survey should have for its object the periodic taking of the measurements of children and young persons in schools and factories, enlisting for this purpose the assistance, among others, of school teachers and factory surgeons, supplemented by a small staff of professional surveyors. Besides this, a more comprehensive and specialised survey, spread over a longer period, of the population of the country at large might be undertaken."

In the earlier part of the Report—on page 11, paragraph 56—the Committee recommend that two ages should be selected at which every child in school attendance should be measured by a teacher or other officer selected by the education authority for the purpose, the particulars being recorded on a card provided by the central bureau.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: What is the noble Lord reading from?

*THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: From page 11, paragraph 56 of the Report. Undoubtedly, this seemed to the Committee to be a very practical proposal, but I do not think they foresaw the difficulties that would lie in the way of carrying out such a proposal. It they did, they would have been bound to recognise that where such a great mass of evidence had to be collected and so vast a number of children dealt with, the cards alluded to would have to be collected under some supervision other than that of the local authorities. Possibly they did foresee that, and perhaps it was for that reason they suggested that there should be appointed in London a central bureau. But when we go on a little further and find them suggesting that, in addition, there should be an advisory council, I am inclined to think that they imagined that the bureau, which would be composed entirely of officials, would not have sufficient expert knowledge of itself, and that to supply that expert knowledge an advisory council should be appointed in addition to the bureau. From this line of reasoning I deduce that there was no wish for an advisory council without a bureau, and that the bureau would be of use only if the measurements as shown on the cards were of such a character that it was absolutely impossible for the local authorities to deal with them.

Now, my Lords, how is this possible? According to paragraph 56 on page 11, the Committee recommend that every child in school attendance should be measured by a teacher or other officer. That is a very difficult thing to carry out. Though, perhaps, in the great majority of cases no objection would be raised, yet because of the minority who might object compulsion would be necessary, and to attain that end legislation would be required. Now, I do not hesitate to say on behalf of His Majesty's Government that they do not see their way at the present time—I do not know that they would at any time—to institute legislation for the purpose of making such measurements compulsory, and that is what paragraph 56, if taken literally, must mean. So much for the question of the anthropometric survey.

Then the noble Duke has asked what the various Departments concerned are doing to meet the recommendations of what I have called the Fitzroy Committee. With regard to the Department with which I am associated—the Board of Education—I can say that we have not been idle. In March last I appointed a Committee to inquire into some of the recommendations, and to see how far the matter could be met by administration without resort to legislation. The Committee was a Departmental Committee on medical inspection and the provision of meals for children attending public elementary schools. The portion of the terms of reference dealing with the question of medical inspection is as follows—

"To ascertain and report on what is now being done, and with what result, in respect of the medical inspection of children in public elementary schools."

What we want is to be told exactly what is being done at the present time and to see how far we can act on that. I may as well read the second portion of the terms of reference; it is not exactly relevant to the point with which I am now dealing, but it may save my having to allude to it later on. It is as follows—

"To inquire into the methods employed and the sums expended in the relief given by various voluntary agencies for the provision of meals for children in public elementary schools and to report whether any relief of this character could be better organised without any charge on the public funds both generally and with special regard to children who, although not defective, are by mal-nutrition below the normal standard."

I mention these points to show that the Board of Education has not been idle since the presentation of this Report, but are endeavouring to see what they can do without having recourse to legislation.

But Questions were asked as to what the Government are doing. The three Departments chiefly affected by the Report of the Fitzroy Committee are the Board of Education, the Home Office, and the Local Government Board. My noble friend behind me who represents the Local Government Board will deal with their side of the question. I shall begin by stating what the Board of Education have done, and afterwards, on behalf of the Home Office, I shall say a few words on the question of infant mortality, which was raised by the right rev. Prelate.

The subjects dealt with in the Report have, to a certain extent, been referred to by Lord Meath. My noble friend drew attention to the dangers of alcoholism, as alluded to in the Report. With regard to that, I can say that the Board have been giving very special attention to methods of instruction in temperance and some of the simpler points as regards the physiological effects of alcohol. With the co-operation of certain eminent medical and scientific men the Board will shortly issue suggestions for a syllabus for use in public elementary schools.

Another question dealt with by the Report, and referred to by my noble friend, is that of rural education. Upon that I have to say that the Board of Education have established a new post and appointed a specially skilled expert adviser in this subject, Mr. T. S. Dymond, who is now investigating the best methods of developing rural education in various directions. The Board are also seriously urging the attention of training college authorities to the importance of nature study and other practical subjects for rural schools.

My noble friend next inquired about the training of teachers in cookery and domestic hygiene. In this matter the Board have been making very special investigations, having appointed five new women inspectors specially chosen for this purpose, and having established a new post of chief woman inspector with the special object of improving the existing organisation for the teaching of domestic subjects. The various training schools of cookery and domestic training throughout the country are being specially inspected with a view to requiring considerable improvements in their methods. The instruction of children in elementary schools in these subjects is also undergoing special revision. The Board have issued new instructions in regard to the teaching of these subjects in training colleges for elementary school teachers, and special attention has been drawn to this new departure in respect of our training college work.

Another recommendation of the Committee referred to school attendance in rural districts. As President of the Board I have frequently drawn the attention of local authorities and other to the possibilities of allowing boys of suitable age and qualifications to be exempt to some extent from school attendance with the view to healthy employment in rural districts. Another recommendation is with regard to special schools for retarded children. The Board have made new arrangements in the Code for facilitating the provision of special schools with specially devised courses and arrangements for "retarded children." The Committee also made a recommendation on infant management and of instruction in municipal crèches. The Board have been conducting, through their women inspectors, a special investigation into the present methods employed in infants' schools and into improvements which are most needed in the management and handling of infants in public elementary schools generally. Very instructive reports from the women inspectors will shortly be issued on this matter.

Another point dealt with in the Report is the question of continuation classes for persons of both sexes where physical exercises for boys and domestic training for girls shall predominate. The Board have made a new arrangement by which grants are specially made to encourage courses in physical exercises in continuation schools throughout the country. Similar encouragement is also given to continuation classes in domestic subjects for girls and young women at times carefully chosen to be convenient for those who are already earning their living. In this way great encouragement is being given to really practical instruction in domestic subjects to those classes of the population which specially need it.

Another recommendation is in regard to partial exemption from school under special conditions. This matter has been carefully considered, and so far as little children are concerned the Board have now removed the obligation for the attendance of children under five years of age. Local authorities will now have complete option in this respect, and several authorities are already deciding that children under five shall not be taught in school. As regards the exemption of older scholars, on the lines of recommendation 38 on page 96 of the FitzRoy Committee's Report, the matter has been thoroughly discussed in the House of Lords, but the Board have not yet seen their way to introducing legislation on the subject in view of the heavy burden of expenditure which would of necessity be thrown upon local authorities were any large provision of continuation classes made obligatory. With regard to physical exercises for children in elementary schools, which was another recommendation of the Committee, the Board have given the matter special attention. We have appointed a special adviser, and an admirable syllabus of physical exercises for elementary schools has been issued.

Therefore, my Lords, on behalf of the Board of Education, I may say that there were ten recommendations made by the Fitzroy Committee, all of which have been attended to and acted upon by the Board. I attribute this largely to the fact that the noble Duke, at my instigation, placed on the Committee one of the permanent officials of the Board of Education, who discharged his duties with such ability that I think we can say it is to him we owe the satisfactory position we now occupy with regard to the recommendations of the Committee. I have said all I have to say with regard to my own Department, and I hope I have shown that the Board of Education, at any rate, have not been idle, but have done their best to carry out the recommendations of the Committee.

Now, my Lords, I have to speak for a few moments as the deputy of the Home Office on this occasion, and I turn naturally to the question raised so pathetically and eloquently by the right rev. Prelate—that of infant mortality. Most of the points which he has raised concern the Local Government Board and will be dealt with by my noble friend Lord Kenyon, but the right rev. Prelate has touched on one point which more especially concerns the Home Office. I refer to the question of the employment of women in factories after childbirth. The suggestion of the Committee would require legislation, and it does not touch the real difficulty, viz., that of proving knowledge. If the suggested alteration of the law were made, the employer or his agent would still plead that he did not know that it was for her confinement the woman was absent. This plea is very often justified, because the women conceal the fact themselves in order that they may get back to work soon, and when they choose to do this it is hard to find a way of securing the observance of the law.

Another matter touching the Home Office is the recommendation that there should be a special magistrate for juvenile cases. The Home Office say that this proposal is not regarded as feasible. The provision of a special Court, or Courts, and magistrates, would usually result in children having to make excessively long journeys to and from the Court, besides entailing extra expense. In London at the present time excellent arrangements are made for hearing children's cases. They are taken, whenever possible, first in the day; and in any event the children are kept during the whole of the time entirely separate from adult prisoners. This for some time has been the practice of the Metropolitan Courts, and has lately been embodied by the Home Secretary in a set of definite regulations which he has issued to those Courts; and he is now considering the question of issuing a circular to Courts outside the Metropolis, with a view to bringing the same practice into operation so far as possible in places where it does not at present obtain. With regard to the sanitary inspection of workshops, the Home Office are of opinion that the local authorities are more fitted than the central authority to deal with the extremely numerous places of this class. The Factory Department, however, receive and examine the reports of medical officers of health. With several of the other findings of the Committee the Home Office are not in agreement. They are not satisfied that sufficient evidence was received.

I am afraid, my Lords, that I have trespassed at considerable length upon your patience with what I must call a very dull speech, but I have endeavoured to prove, on behalf of the Department with which I am associated, that we have not ignored the recommendations of the Committee, but that we have studied them and are considering how far it is possible to give effect to them.

LORD KENYON: My Lords, on behalf of the Local Government Board, I will do my best to deal with the various matters which have been referred to in the previous speeches, but the ground covered has been so very wide that I must ask you to forgive me if I omit to deal with the whole of it. First of all, in answer to Lord Meath, who touched upon matters relative to the Local Government Board. The noble Lord asked about a register of sickness, and said that the Committee thought that such a register was very desirable. The Poor Law district medical officers do keep a book showing the cases attended by them, which specifies the nature of the disease. But the object of the book is rather to show what they do, and in what cases extra food, etc., is recommended by them. No return of the entries is made to any central authority, and the books are not kept in such a way as to afford any record of sickness on which reliance could be placed. Therefore a thorough recasting of the books would be required, and the work of examination and tabulation would be very heavy indeed. Moreover, when done it would only apply to a particular class, and it is quite as important to obtain information as to sickness in other classes. No such information could be compulsorily required without legislation, and at present the Board do not see their way to taking such action in the matter.

Then my noble friend Lord Meath also asked about the advisory council which the Committee recommended. That is a question which more directly concerns the Home Office, but it is suggested that the council should advise the Government on legislative and administrative matters concerning public health. The setting up of such a body to undertake functions of this kind would require the most careful consideration, and in the opinion of the Board the model upon which the Committee suggest that the council should be based, viz., *Le Comité Consultatif d'hygiene publique de France* does not appear to be one which could be usefully adapted to the machinery of local government in England, because a great deal of their work is of a distinctly administrative character.

The next point upon which Lord Meath dwelt was the question of overcrowding, and he said that the Committee suggested the fixing of a standard. The local authorities at present have no power to fix a standard of overcrowding generally. Overcrowding is a nuisance which may be dealt with under the Public Health Acts by summary proceedings before justices; but it would rest with the Court to determine whether a nuisance had or had not been committed. Legislation would be necessary to enable the Committee's suggestion to be carried out. The Committee also recommend that the Board should send local authorities statements as to the law on the subject of their powers as to overcrowding and insanitary property. The Board have from time to time issued to local authorities digests of the law relating to the housing of the working classes and as to nuisances, including overcrowding.

With regard to labour colonies, a Departmental Committee was appointed by the Local Government Board last year, with the concurrence of the Home Office, with regard to vagrancy, and one of the matters which is being investigated by that Committee is the question of labour colonies and the detention of persons in them. The Report of the Committee is expected to be made this year.

The next point, I think, had regard to building and open spaces. The Committee think that local authorities in contiguous areas which are becoming urban should co-operate in securing proper building regulations, and that the making of building by-laws should be made compulsory on urban and rural authorities. The present position is, as your Lordships know, that every urban authority can, subject to the consent of the Local Government Board, make by-laws, and practically they have all done so. At present there is a Committee sitting which is inquiring into the whole question of by-laws in the country, and the view expressed to the Committee on the whole has been that the by-laws err in the direction of too great stringency rather than too little. As Lord Meath very well pointed out, houses that are suitable for erection in London may not be suitable for erection in rural areas. I have no doubt that the Bill brought in by Lord Hylton will be returned to your Lordships' House in a few days, as amended in Committee. There are difficulties in the way of compelling local authorities to make by-laws. They cannot be prevented from submitting inadequate by-laws for confirmation. If the central authority refuses to confirm, the local authorities say the responsibility no longer rests with them but with the Local Government Board. If the central authority do confirm, they are placed in the position of confirming by-laws which they know to be inadequate, because they cannot get better ones made.

Then with regard to smoke pollution, the Committee advocate that cases of complaint of pollution by smoke, etc., in manufacturing districts should be heard by a stipendiary magistrate, and that higher penalties should be imposed. Summary proceedings can be taken under the Public Health Acts for the abatement of smoke nuisance, and when there is a stipendiary magistrate the complaint would come before him. The real difficulty is that in manufacturing districts the local authorities consist largely of manufacturers, who are not anxious to take proceedings in respect of smoke nuisance arising from manufactories. It may be doubted whether an increase in the penalties would much help matters, but at all events legislation would be needed for the purpose.

With reference to a register of owners of houses, the chief difficulty is that is would entail a compulsory registration of titles. The question of compulsory registration of titles has been brought up several times, and not very successfully. It would open up a very large question, and I do not know that this House is prepared to deal with it.

The next point is with regard to medical officers of health. The Board agree with the suggestions of the Committee as to the expediency of whole time appointments where the population is large, and the officer is properly qualified. In cases where the population is above, say, 100,000, and the circumstances of the district are such as to make considerable demands upon the officer, the Board urge that his whole time should be given to his duties, or, at all events, to public health work, *i.e.*, that he should be debarred from private practice. But the question is largely one of cost. The Board think that where a medical officer of health gives his whole time he should have a salary of at least £500 a year. District councils, however, are not always willing to pay this, and the salary would obviously be burdensome except where the rateable value is large. As regards permanency of tenure, the Board's view is that if the medical officer is a competent man, properly qualified and duly remunerated, and gives his whole time to his duties, there is an advantage in giving him permanency of tenure, so that he may act independently, and without fear of losing his office if he offends people by discharging his duty. Where an officer does not devote his whole time, the Board have sometimes sanctioned a permanent appointment where he has held office for some years and has shown himself efficient. There is a danger where a man has private practice that his official duties will be sacrificed to them, and there are objections to making the appointment permanent. The Board have, however, encouraged appointments being made for a term of years—say five or seven—where the circumstances justified it, although the officer does not devote his whole time to his duties.

The next question is with regard to reports from local authorities. I think it was Lord Shuttleworth who asked whether the reports were given to the local authorities. I have to say that at the present time each medical officer of health makes an annual report to the sanitary authority as to what is being done and left undone in the district, and copies are sent to the county council and to the Local Government Board. Special reports are also made when outbreaks of infectious disease occur. The reports when received by the Board are examined by them, and if necessary they correspond with the sanitary authority upon their shortcomings. The Board do, therefore, watch closely local administration, and endeavour constantly to level up backward districts. Moreover, the Board cause local inspections to be made by their medical inspectors, so far as the staff allows, where the circumstances appear to call for it. Whether it would be practicable to increase the number of such inspections is a matter which is receiving the Board's consideration at the present moment.

I come now to the Question dealt with so ably by the right rev. Prelate, and I am sure all Members of this House will agree with every word he said. Lord Shuttleworth also asked some Questions on the subject, viz., with reference to infant mortality. The Board concur in the view that still-births should be registered, but an amendment of the law would be necessary for this purpose. They also think that an amendment of the law is desirable as to the certification of deaths, so as to make more stringent the requirements as to the obtaining of medical certificates and the investigation of cases where there is no certificate. They have for some time past been considering a measure for dealing with this matter, but there has been no opportunity for legislation. As regards milk supply, urban and rural district councils are empowered to make regulations with regard to dairies, cowsheds, and milk shops dealing with the inspection of these places, regulating their ventilation, cleansing, etc., and other matters. The local authorities are not bound to make these regulations at present: they are only authorised to do so. But the Committee suggest that where they do not make regulations, their powers should pass to the county councils, and that in the last resort it should be the duty of the Local Government Board to intervene. It may be observed, however, that out of 1,794 local authorities empowered to make regulations under the Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milk Shops Order, no less than 1,255 have regulations in force in their district. As regards the suggested supersession of these bodies by the county council where the local authority do not make and enforce regulations, regard must be had to the friction which would almost certainly arise, especially where the defaulting authority was a borough or urban district council. In any case legislation would be necessary to give effect to the recommendation of the Committee.

I think I have now dealt with most of the matters referred to, except that of the training of mothers, with reference to which Lord Shuttleworth asked some Questions. The Committee suggested that mothers should be trained in matters of hygiene and domestic economy. The Board have considered this subject, but there are difficulties in the way of local authorities undertaking the instruction of mothers in these matters, though some of them have undertaken it by means of health visitors, and there is an increasing tendency to make such appointments. The Board sympathise with action of the kind, but in the present state of the information on the subject they have not felt able to issue any circular with regard to it. With regard to the general question of giving further powers to sanitary authorities in connection with infant mortality, it may be observed that advantage might possibly accrue if an earlier notification of births could be secured, more especially in industrial areas. At present a birth need not be registered for six weeks, but if the sanitary authority are to intervene with a view to advising mothers, *e.g.*, as to the feeding of a child, it is essential that they should have early notification of the birth—say within a period of forty-eight hours. To render such a notification compulsory legislation would be required. In some places it is understood that arrangements have been made for a voluntary notification, but any proposal to make it compulsory would need careful consideration. In the event of such legislation being proposed, it would perhaps be advisable to make it in the first instance adoptive at the option of the local authority rather than general.

On the question of rural housing, the Committee suggested that rural district councils should remedy the dearth of cottages by the exercise of their powers under Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, as amended by the Act of 1900. Rural councils can adopt Part III. with the consent of the county council, and can then provide cottages. They are reluctant to do so, but the Act of 1903 enables the county council to supersede them if the parish council ask the county council to do so. The Board have called the attention of the rural district councils and county councils to their powers in this matter.

With regard to adulteration, the Committee recommend that the Board should be authorised to fix a standard of purity for all foods and drinks. The Board have considered this matter, and as a preliminary step have appointed a special food inspector to obtain information as to matters connected with adulteration, and to communicate with and supervise the action of public analysts.

I hope that what I have said will show that the Local Government Board are considering the Report, and doing what they can to carry out such portions of it as do not require fresh legislation.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I feel that it is impossible not to sympathise with the two noble Lords who have just spoken, in view of the enormous range of the subject with which they have been attempting to deal. The fact is that any person trying to deal with this Report, if he does not take all knowledge as his province, must, at all events, take all social knowledge, because it deals with almost every conceivable social question that can confront a statesman of the present day. There are included the question of education, the question of housing, the question of overcrowding, the question of the bringing up of children, and a great number of kindred subjects. But, in spite of that, we on this bench do not feel that the whole question has been dealt with in a very sympathetic spirit by either of the noble Lords who have spoken for the Government. In the first place, the Question raised by the noble Duke on the Cross Benches received, I think, rather a short shrift at the hands of the noble Marquess the President of the Board of Education.

*THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: I am afraid I must interrupt the noble Earl. I stated that we were not in a position to know how far the proposals of the Fitz Roy Committee with regard to an anthropometrical survey could be taken up; that if measurements were to be taken to the extent they propose it would have to be made compulsory; and that we were not in a position to bring in legislation to appoint an advisory council.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I quite understand, but I do not gather that the Committee in their Report regarded it as absolutely certain that compulsion would be required. If my recollection is right, there was no evidence to show that serious objection would be taken by any large number of parents to such measurements as would be required for this purpose. I noticed with some approval the evidence of one witness, to the effect that pedantic accuracy ought not to be striven for, and that if general measurements could be obtained the result aimed at might be to a very great extent achieved. But I confess I was sorry that the noble Marquess threw such a jet of cold water on the recommendation of the noble Duke. What I think he really intended to convey was that in his opinion, and in the opinion of those who advise him, such a survey would cost some money, and that they did not consider it was worth the money it would cost.

As regards the other questions with which the noble Marquess dealt, I cheerfully recognise that the Board of Education have made some very considerable and real attempts to deal with the minor matters recommended by the Committee. I will not occupy your Lordships' time by going through them, but it certainly does seem to be a welcome evidence of activity. I also agree with the noble Marquess that it is to be accounted for by the fact that an eminent official of his Department was one of those who were called upon to consider the question.

But, my Lords, when we come to the questions affecting the Local Government Board, the field is too wide for me to attempt to deal with it at all. I rather regret that the noble Earl on the Cross Benches—although I largely sympathise with his enthusiasm on this question—endeavoured to deal so fully as he did with the matter. I think if he had adopted the course taken the noble Duke and by my noble friend Lord Shuttleworth, and had concentrated his attention and the attention of the House more particularly on one or two points, the result would have been more satisfactory, as it would have made it possible for His Majesty's Government to give a more detailed reply on the points raised. As it was, it was hardly possible for the noble Lord opposite to do anything else than give very brief, and I am afraid I must call them rather perfunctory, replies to a number of the Questions which were raised. I could wish, for instance, that the Government had found it possible to go a little more into detail on the question raised by the right rev. Prelate, and by my noble friend—the crucial and important question of infant mortality. I gladly recognise, however, that if the Departments are prepared to proceed with the provision for the earlier notification of births a very considerable step in advance will have been taken. I am bound to say that all through I was struck by both noble Lords saying in almost horror-stricken tones that legislation would be required to carry these proposals into effect. Well, what if it is? After all, legislation is required for many things, and it seems to come with poor grace from noble Lords who have the whole time of both Houses of Parliament at their disposal that they should complain of the fact that legislation is required in order to give effect to certain valuable provisions. What I hope is that the Departments concerned, and those in charge of them will take very careful note of the points upon which they have spoken to-day, and that they will register at all events an inward determination to bring forward at the earliest possible opportunity a Bill containing these provisions, which are undoubtedly of great value in themselves.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I do not desire to prolong this debate, and I rise merely for the purpose of repudiating as strongly as I can the idea that His Majesty's Government regard the contents of this Report with indifference, or its recommendations without sympathy. I take it that the object of the noble Lords who have addressed us this evening is to obtain an assurance that this Blue-book is not going to meet with the fate of many Blue-books, and be pigeon-holed and forgotten. That assurance I am prepared to give, and I think the right rev. Prelate who spoke first this evening put the case in appropriate language when he expressed a hope that inquiry and investigation would not cease with the publication of this Report. But we do consider that further inquiry and further investigation will have to be made before many of these recommendations can be taken up. On many facts we desire fuller evidence than has yet been collected: we should be better assured that the proposed remedies will be appropriate to the disease, that they are remedies the patient will take, and for which the public will be ready to pay.

We must, indeed, all have been struck by the vastness of the programme which has been put before us by the Inter-departmental Committee. I will not attempt to enumerate the fifty-four subjects dealt with in the Report. They have to do with the housing and distribution of the population of this country; they have to do with the regulation of factories, shops, and mines; they have to do with education, with the hygienic condition of the houses of the poorer classes, with disease, and drink; and, lastly, with the great question of the collection of statistics dealing with these important subjects. That is, as I have said, an immense programme, and I am bound to say it is a programme which to my mind extends considerably beyond the scope within which it was originally proposed that the Committee should confine its labours. There is a certain amount of mystery as to the origin of the expanded instruction under which the Committee set to work; it is not quite clear whether it first saw the light during the last moments of the noble Duke's official career, or in the first moments of my noble friend's term of office; but, whoever was the parent, the Committee proved itself a most vigorous bantling, and proceeded on its career with an energy and courage that must command admiration.

One thing will not be disputed by the Committee itself, that when it was first appointed it was intended that its investigations should be preliminary to a wider inquiry to be undertaken by a Royal Commission. The appointment of the Committee arose, as the noble Duke has said, out of the conclusions he had arrived at with regard to the physical condition of the British Army, and from that it grew until instead of being a mere inquiry preliminary to a larger inquiry, it, perhaps in spite of itself, became seized of a number of subjects sufficient to have afforded work, not for one Royal Commission, but for half-a-dozen Royal Commissions. It seems to me to follow from that that we must proceed with a certain amount of caution in acting upon the recommendations of the Committee; and I think it is perhaps a little hard that after the statements made on behalf of the three Departments concerned there should be complaint that the subjects have not been more vigorously dealt with. My noble friend who has charge of the Education Department was able to tell your Lordships that every one of the ten educational points dealt with in this Report had occupied the attention of the Board of Education.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: Had all been acted upon.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: And had all been acted upon. In the same way my noble friend who represents the Local Government Board was able to show that at many points matters comprised within the Report of the Committee had been administratively dealt with. Therefore, my Lords, I do not think that we are open to the charge of having brushed aside the recommendations of the Committee, and I am very glad in closing the debate to assure the House that we shall certainly bear in mind what the Committee have reported; and that we recognise the value of its services in directing the attention of the public and Parliament to a number of most vital points affecting to the root the well-being of the people of this country.

*THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: My Lords, I do not think there can be any doubt on the point of the two references to the Committee. I have not a very accurate recollection of how the amended reference came about, but I have no doubt whatever that I was myself responsible for it. I have also a clear recollection that the original reference and the proposal to appoint a Committee were submitted to the Cabinet, but I could not undertake absolutely to assert that the extended terms of reference were also submitted to the Cabinet. It is quite possible that in the press of business at the close of the session that formality may have been omitted, and I am prepared to undertake responsibility for the extension of the terms of the original reference. I am extremely indebted for the sympathetic manner in which the noble Marquess referred to the recommendation to which I chiefly called attention, and I trust that in the further consideration intended to be given to the Report that essential point, the collection of accurate statistics, will not be abandoned. Difficulties there are, I admit, but I am sure they will not be found insuperable.

QUIT AND CROWN RENTS (IRELAND).

LORD CASTLETOWN rose "To move for a Return showing all sums received for the redemption and purchase of quit and Crown rents in Ireland since 1897; and, if possible, an approximate Return of the amount likely to be received for redemption of quit and Crown rents out of the £25,000,000 purchase money already hypothecated for sale of land to tenants in Ireland; and to ask whether any instructions have been issued to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests to purchase or acquire 'land or hereditaments' under Section 4 of the Land Act, 1903, and under the provisions of the Crown Lands Act, 1829."

The noble Lord said: My Lords, as the Motion and Question standing in my name on the Paper may appear rather complicated, I will in a few words explain my reasons for putting them down. Two years ago I asked for a similar Return, and was told that if I pressed for it I should be able to get it; but at the same time my noble friend Lord Spencer called me to order—quite rightly, I believe—because I asked some Questions connected with a Bill which was then in the other House, and which is now the Irish Land Act of 1903. Therefore I did not then press for a Return, but I ask to-night that the Return standing in my name on the Paper should be given.

Section 4 of the Act of 1903 enables land to be bought by the State and invested in trustees for improvement, afforestation, and other purposes. To make my point clear I will quote one or two sentences from the reply that was given to me in 1903 on this subject by the Earl of Denbigh. The noble Earl said—

> "Under the Crown Lands Act, 1829, the sums received under the heads refered to must be invested in the purchase of lands and hereditaments, or the redemption of charges or incumbrances on land already belonging to the Crown."

At the end of his Answer Lord Denbigh used these words—

> "Moreover, by attempting to ear-mark those funds for the definite purposes of investment in Ireland you would be giving away the principle that Crown lands are not the property of the particular district in which they are situated, but the property of the nation as a whole."

We have to deal with Section 4 of the Act of 1903, with the remarks made by the noble Earl, and with the obvious intentions of the Crown Lands Act of 1829. It is manifest that the Commissioners of Woods and Forests now have power to buy land under Section 4, and that they might be induced to ear-mark the utilisation of those funds which are now coming in by the redemption of quit and Crown rents for the particular county from which they come.

Another point which bears upon this is the origin of quit and Crown rents. They arose, as a rule, from licences given by the Crown to those who had taken confiscated land, and who paid a quit rent to the Crown for that land. These people denuded the lands of the forests which were on them, and the lands are now being sold by the present proprietors under the Act, of 1903, and the quit and Crown rents or licences are being redeemed and invested in a capital sum by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests. I think it is now possible for the Commissioners of Woods and Forests to acquire lands under Section 4 of the Act, and, by utilising the clauses of the Crown Lands Act, carry out the policy laid down in the Act of 1903, and make a really sound scheme of State afforestation. They can do that, I think, without impinging in any way on Treasury finance or asking for any grant, and also without any fresh legislation. I therefore ask the noble Lord whether he can grant the Return and also answer the Question standing in my name on the Paper.

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing all sums received for the redemption and purchase of quit and Crown rents in Ireland since 1897."—(*Lord Castletown.*)

*THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Lord WINDSOR): My Lords, there is no difficulty whatever in giving my noble friend the Return which he asks for in the first part of his Question. As he is aware, a Return was made in 1902 to the other House of Parliament, and figures were given showing that between 1898 and 1902 a total sum of

£75,741 had been received at that time from these quit rents. I have the figures of the next three years with me. The sums received for the redemption of quit rents, etc., in Ireland in the year ended March 31st, 1903, was £17,832; in the year ended March 31st, 1904, £9,015; and in the year ended March 31st, 1905, £16,136; making, with the figures of the former term, a total since March 31st, 1897, of £118,724. If my noble friend would like that Return in complete form given to the House there would be no objection whatever in laying it.

Then, in the Question, my noble friend, asks for an approximate Return of the amount likely to be received for redemption of quit and Crown rents out of the £25,000,000 purchase money already hypothecated for sale of land to tenants in Ireland. I am instructed that there are not sufficient materials at present available for estimating the amount likely to be received for the redemption under this heading. I am sure he will understand that there is difficulty is estimating what such a sum as that is likely to amount to. He has suggested that under Section 4 of the Land Act of 1903 all these quit rents coming to the Crown might be utilised for the purpose of purchasing land for afforestation, but the purpose to which the monies of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests are devoted seem to be of an entirely different nature from this. The Commissioners of Woods and Forests consider that the monies under their administration should be invested in land, giving some return in the shape of rents. I am informed that it would be departing a considerable way from the policy of the Commissioners, even if it were possible to do so, for land to be purchased which would give no return for a considerable time, upon which large sums of money would have to be spent, and in connection with which the return, if any, would be somewhat problematical.

No instructions have been issued to the Commissioners to purchase or acquire land or hereditaments under Section 4 of the Irish Land Act. This section contemplates advances to private trustees to enable them to make purchases for the purposes mentioned in the section. The Commissioners of Woods and Forests do not require advances for any purchases that they may make. They invest the money which they have for investment under the Crown Lands Act of 1829, and the difficulty probably lies in departing from the policy which they have pursued under that Act. I may mention the fact that the Commissioners have recently, I believe this year, invested £10,000 in the purchase of land in Ireland, but not for afforestation purposes; and should, in their opinion, suitable occasions offer in the future, I believe that further purchases will be made.

On Question, Motion agreed to; and ordered accordingly.

THE FLOGGING OF CHINAMEN.

*LORD COLERIDGE rose "To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, having regard to his statement in this House on May 16th, 1905, his attention has been called to the evidence of Mr. Stewart, late compound manager of the Crœsus Mine, at the inquest in Johannesburg on the death of Mr. A. Bradley, as reported in the *Johannesburg Star* of June 23rd, 1905, in which he is reported to have said, 'where he had considered the Chinamen wrong he had in many cases flogged them; it was against the law to flog them, but he had done so'; and whether any action has been taken in the matter, and, if not, whether His Majesty's Government propose to take any action, and, if not, why not."

The noble and learned Lord said: My Lords, on May 16th this year I asked the noble Duke for information with regard to the suspicions I entertained as to flogging taking place in the Chinese compounds in South Africa. The noble Duke referred me to a statement made by Lord Milner. He also said it was illegal—which I knew—for any flogging to take place in compounds; that all floggings had to be imposed by a magistrate and sanctioned by a Court, and that as it was illegal it was impossible. At the time the noble Duke spoke there appeared in a well-known newspaper at the Cape—the *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette*, dated April 29th—a long account of a visit to the compounds on the Rand, and I will give the noble Duke a few extracts from this account—

> "In one compound that I visited there were, say, 2,500 coolies, of whom 60 per cent. have had a 'licking' since their arrival."

Continuing, the writer says—

> "Let us take one typical morning's work. Twenty coolies are lined up outside the compound manager's office. They are marched in one by one by Chinese policemen and charged. The charge may be anything—from malingering to opium-smoking, or failing to report after a shift. The sentence usually varies from five to fifty strokes. These are administered variously. On one compound that I visited the punishment is carried out most expeditiously. 'Ten,' says the compound manager, speaking in Chinese, and the unhappy coolie walks to another part of the same room between two or three Chinese policemen to take his gruel. The coolie lowers his pantaloons, falls flat on the boards (face downwards), and 'prepares to receive the enemy.' One policeman keeps his head in position, another his feet. The Lord High Executioner armed with a whip—a piece of leather three inches wide attached to a wooden handle about three feet long—then metes out the punishment. After the second stroke the coolie will probably groan and wail, but immediately after the last he is brought to his feet, and with a *coup de derriere* from a policeman's No. 9 boot he is sent about his business."

He went to another compound and described what took place there. In one case he says—

> "the sentence was two whippings of fifty lashes each."

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Duke of MARLBOROUGH): Will the noble and learned Lord give me the name of his informant?

LORD COLERIDGE: The account is anonymous. The writer continues—

> "These whippings were administered in public. And in this case the victim did really and truly weep. The number of whippings varies according to the temperament of the compound managers. Some believe implicitly in their police and headmen; they accept their stories, and act accordingly. Others listen carefully to both sides and (provided they know the language well enough) give the accused coolies the fairest play. On some mines the strap is not used. Instead, a cane is laid across the shoulders at the rate of about three cuts per second; but of course the number of strokes is much greater than when the leather lash is applied."

That account is anonymous, and I am not saying it is correct. I am saying that at the time the noble Duke spoke there was this paper circulated in the colony with this account in it. What I wish to ask the noble Duke is whether any heed was taken of that account, and any attempt made to find out who wrote it; whether it was true; or whether there was any foundation for it. At this time the Government were asserting that no such thing took place, and down to July 13th the Colonial Secretary had stated in the House of Commons that he had no information of any kind on the subject.

Now the attention of His Majesty's Government has been directed to an account of an inquest which appeared in the *Johannesburg Star* of June 23rd; and in that report a Mr. Stewart, who was called, stated upon oath that—

> "Where he had considered the Chinamen wrong he had in many cases flogged them; it was against the law to flog them, but he had done so."

That witness was the late compound manager of the Crœsus Mine. In the face of that statement, the Colonial Secretary had to admit that illegal flogging was being practised in the compounds. I wish to ask why these things escape the attention of His Majesty's Government and why it is left to private Members in one or the other House of Parliament to draw attention to these scandals. The Government have every opportunity of obtaining this information and finding out for themselves. They were asked whether these things were going on, and assured us they were not. Why, I ask, is it left to private Members to ascertain and, if I may say so, expose the illegalities now admitted to be practised in the compounds?

Mr. W. Evans, superintendent of the Foreign Labour Department in Johannesburg, was very indignant at the allegation of slavery (page 84, Cd. 2401). He pointed out that the cry of slavery had touched him personally, for he had been for over twenty years a member of the Civil Service in the Straits Settlements and had been closely in touch with Chinese, and he submitted that the record of his service ought to disprove any allegation of the existence of slavery. Why has not Mr. Evans discovered these practices? No doubt he is desirous of repudiating any sympathy with such practices as these, but what has taken place I think shows that Mr. Evans has singularly neglected his duty, or in some way or other has not been able to command the information that his post ought to enable him to obtain. I have no doubt that the noble Duke will say that such practices have not the sanction of His Majesty's Government, and that so far as the Government are concerned they shall be put down; but I can assure the noble Duke that unless greater efforts are made to obtain the truth in the future than have been made in the past they are likely to continue.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: My Lords, before I reply to the specific Questions which the noble and learned Lord has put on the Paper, perhaps I may deal for a moment with one or two of the observations which fell from him. He expressed regret that on May 16th when we last debated this question of the treatment of the Chinese coolies I then stated that, as far as our official information went, there were no cases of unauthorised flogging. The noble and learned Lord reminded me that on April 28th a newspaper circulating in the colony furnished a long account of gross outrages inflicted on the Chinese, and he said that it was remarkable that the Colonial Office was not aware of the statement. The noble Lord must remember that it takes three weeks for a paper to reach this country from South Africa, and it would have been impossible for us to be in possession of that particular paper on the day that I addressed the House.

The noble and learned Lord expressed regret that we were not more fully aware of these anonymous statements made in the Press of South Africa. The noble and learned Lord is perfectly well aware that the Secretary of State has frequently stated that he would be only too willing to inquire into any specific case brought forward and in which it could be shown that illegal flogging had been administered to Chinamen. My right hon. friend will be perfectly prepared to go thoroughly into such a case and investigate it. But in the case of vague and indefinite stories by gentlemen who write in the Press without giving their names as to illegal floggings having been administered, it is very difficult to trace their origin. The High Commissioner has been requested on many occasions to endeavour to ascertain whether the general statements made had any foundation in fact, and it has always been found practically impossible to trace the original instances on which those general statements were made.

The noble and learned Lord twitted His Majesty's Government with the fact that they were not fully aware of the general statements that had been circulated, and he mentioned a statement which was made on June 24th and reported in the *Johannesburg Star*. That statement has only been in the possession of the Colonial Office a few days, but long before the noble Lord had put his Question on the Paper we had communicated with South Africa in order to try to ascertain whether there was any truth in that statement. We did not wait until the noble and learned Lord had raised the question, or until it was raised in another place. We are perfectly prepared to give the noble and learned Lord every information we can with regard to specific cases. Our attention has been drawn to the fact that this late compound manager said that he had in many cases flogged Chinamen and that he knew he had done it in contravention of the law. It seems, undoubtedly, that an illegality has been committed, and I need scarcely assure the noble and learned Lord that the Secretary of State is quite determined to put the practice down. The noble and learned Lord is anxious to know what action we are going to take in this particular matter. We are in telegraphic communication with Lord Selborne, who is thoroughly alive to the importance and gravity of the matter, and, no doubt, the consideration of this particular question will form the subject of a recommendation from the High Commissioner to the Secretary of State, and it will then be for the Secretary of State to decide how far he will be able to accept any recommendation made to him. The Government will certainly not depart from the principle they have laid down that Chinamen shall not be flogged except according to law; that is to say, that no Chinaman shall receive corporal punishment unless a sentence has been passed upon him by a magistrate and confirmed by the Supreme Court.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I think the noble Duke's Answer is somewhat unsatisfactory, so far as it touches on the difficulty of dealing with anonymous representations. I did not gather clearly from it that the Secretary of State did take notice of those statements. I maintain that the Government, in dealing with the state of things that exist in South Africa, are bound to find out for themselves whether rumours circulated in the papers are true or not. Both I and my noble friend behind me have had a great many such cases to deal with in Ireland, and we always felt bound to find out whether they were true or not and to deal with them accordingly. I now come to the other part of the noble Duke's Answer. I recognise with satisfaction that the Government have taken steps to communicate with the High Commissioner with regard to this statement, and that the Secretary of State is determined to see that the law is carried out. I think, however, the noble Duke was rather vague as to what was to pass between the High Commissioner and the Secretary of State. It is somewhat strange that the High Commissioner has no power himself to deal with a case so flagrant as that mentioned in the Question.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: The man is no longer a compound manager.

EARL SPENCER: He has been removed?

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: He left some time ago.

EARL SPENCER: Then there may be a difficulty; but I am surprised that the High Commissioner has no power himself to deal with these cases without reference home. I was glad to hear from the noble Duke of the feeling of horror entertained at the Colonial Office at what has taken place. I will only add that we on this side of the House have often been subjected to attacks for the way in which we have met the proposal to introduce Chinese labour into the Transvaal, but I confess that cases of the kind to which attention has been drawn amply justify, in my opinion, the opposition we made at the time.

House adjourned at Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 20th July, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Bangor (County Down) Water and Improvement Bill [Lords]. As amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Llandrindod Wells Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Matlock Bath Improvement Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Littlehampton Urban District Council Bill [Lords] (by Order). Consideration, as amended, deferred till Monday next.

Wigan Corporation Bill. Ordered, That, in the case of the Wigan Corporation Bill, Standing Orders 84, 214, 215, and 239 be suspended, and that the Bill be now taken into Consideration.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill, as amended, accordingly considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

North East London Railway Bill. Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

(King's Consent signified). Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) (No. 2) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords] (by Order). Consideration, as amended, deferred till Tuesday next.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Midland Railway Bill, with Amendments.

PETITION.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN BILL.

Petition from Hackney, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 249.]

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (UNITED KINGDOM).

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1890 to 1904, Fifty-second Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY RETURNS.

Copy presented, of Returns of the Capital, Traffic Receipts, and Working Expenditure of the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BANKRUPTCY.

Copy presented, of Twenty-second General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 250.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (EXCESSES), 1903–4.

Copy presented, of a Statement of the Sum required to be voted in order to make good an Excess on the Grant for Diplomatic and Consular Buildings for the year ended on March 31st, 1904 [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 251.]

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF SIXTY-FIVE).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered July 18th; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 252.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3443 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Caledonian Canal. Copy of One-hundredth Report of the Commissioners [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 253.]

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS (CONTRACTS).

Return ordered, "of all contracts made in the United Kingdom for manufactured articles by the several Government Departments in the year ending March 31st, 1905, either with contractors outside the United Kingdom or with contractors or agents who obtain the articles from Abroad (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 318, Session 1904)—(*Sir Howard Vincent.*)

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Return ordered, "(1) from each Savings Bank in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, containing, in columns, the names of the Officers, their respective salaries, and other allowances, if any; the amount of security each gives; the annual expenses of management, inclusive of all payments and salaries, for the year ended November 20th, 1904; the rate per centum per annum on the capital of the Bank for the expenses of management; the rate of interest paid to Depositors on the various amounts of deposit, and the average rate of interest on all accounts; the number of accounts remaining open; the total amount owing to Depositors; the total amount invested with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt; the balance in the hands of the Treasurer at November 20th, 1904; the total amount of the separate Surplus Fund on November 20th, 1904; other assets, including estimated value of Bank premises, furniture, etc.; the total assets; the total amount of Government Stock standing to the credit of Depositors; the number and amount of annuities granted; and the average cost of each transaction; also the year in which business commenced in each Bank, and the name of the day or days, and the number of hours in the week, on which the Banks are open for the deposit and withdrawal of moneys; including in such Return a list of all such Savings Banks as, under the provisions of the Act 26 Vic. c. 14, or otherwise, have been closed and have transferred their funds, or any part thereof, to the Post Office Savings Banks; showing, in each case, the number of such Banks, as well as the number and amount of Depositors' accounts so transferred, and the amount of compensation, if any, made to all or any of the Officers of such Banks respectively; and showing also the years in which such Banks were respectively opened and closed, and the number and amount of their Depositors' balances, and the number of days and hours in each week on which the same Banks were open for public business at the close of the year next preceding the date of such closing; distinguishing the same, as in the Return, for each separate county, as well as collectively, for England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, and for the United Kingdom; and (2) for the year ending November 20th, 1904, showing the total number of Depositors in Trustee Savings Banks; the total number of deposits; the average amount of each deposit account; the average sums paid in and drawn out; the total number of persons who have deposited in single sums the entire amount allowed to be deposited during the year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 224, of Session 1904)."—(*Mr. Mount.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Issue of Summonses in Dublin Licensing Cases.

MR. T. HARRINGTON (Dublin Harbour): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is the practice of the Commissioners of the Dublin Metropolitan Police to issue summonses in licensing cases without any examination of the circumstances beyond the mere reading of the reports of the officers of police; and whether, having regard to the number of cases dismissed, he will make an order that in future the solicitor specially appointed to act for the police should be consulted so as to prevent cases of a doubtful or trivial character being brought on.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The facts of each case are carefully considered before a prosecution is instituted. There has been no increase in the proportion of cases dismissed, and it is not the case, as suggested, that summonses are issued in trival or doubtful cases. The Answer to the latter inquiry is in the negative.

Evicted Tenants in County Kerry.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Mr. Fitzgerald Day, of Camp, county Kerry, has sold his lands; and, if so, whether, seeing that there are three evicted tenants, Ellen Scannell, Martin Crean, and Patrick O'Connor, who have not been enabled to purchase their holdings, the

Estates Commissioners will refuse to declare this an estate until those tenants have purchased.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) No proceedings for the sale of this estate have been instituted before the Estates Commissioners.

Defences and Garrisons at Halifax and Esquimault.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government has accepted the proposals of the Dominion Government to take over, on certain conditions, the entire control of the Halifax defences and garrison on July 1st, and that of Esquimault on July 1st, 1906, meanwhile defraying its entire cost; and whether the correspondence that has passed between the two Governments will be laid before Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) His Majesty's Government have accepted the proposals of the Dominion Government as to taking over the defences and garrisons at Halifax and Esquimault. The correspondence on the subject will be presented to Parliament.

Destruction of Papers Relating to War Stores.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the statement of Sir Fleetwood Wilson at the War Stores Commission to the effect that the cause of the disappearance of the missing papers was that a rat got into the store in which the papers were kept, and that the medical officer ordered the destruction of the papers in order to prevent a plague; whether he can state if the medical officer's report was verbal or written; and whether he can communicate the details to the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The details in connection with the matter referred to have already been communicated to the House in reply to a Question put by the hon. Member for South Donegal on February 8th†, 1904, to which I have nothing to add.

Defects of the New Short Rifle.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): To ask the Secretary of State for War if the new short rifle has been abandoned; and if the following defects have been found: that the magazine jams; that the balance is bad; that the metal is too soft, resulting in the barrel being permeated with corrosive gas.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The new short rifle has not been abandoned. A small defect in the magazine spring has recently been reported and a modification introduced to remedy it. The reply as regards the two other alleged defects is in the negative.

Trials of the Short Rifle.

MR. HUNT: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that after the first trial of the short rifle under the direction of Sir William Butler the report upon it was unfavourable, he will explain why a second trial was ordered.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) It is regretted that the ground for the hon. Member's Question is not understood. No trial of the short rifle under the direction of Sir William Butler can be traced.

Efficiency of Volunteer Officers.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state what measures he proposes to take to enable Volunteer officers to make themselves more efficient in view of the fact that the usefulness of the Volunteer force generally depends very largely upon the efficiency of the officers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The general question of promoting the efficiency of Volunteer officers is receiving careful consideration, and I am not at present in a position to make any definite statement as to the detailed measures which it may be considered advisable to carry out.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxix., 575

Treatment of Children Awaiting Trial.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will cause instructions to be issued to the Metropolitan Police within the county of London that all children arrested on Saturdays and holidays, or at such time that they cannot at once be brought before the magistrate, shall be taken to one of the remand homes provided by the Metropolitan Asylums Board, and thus save the children from being detained in the police cells for any time.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) As I stated in my Answer to a Question asked by my right hon. friend the Member for Oxford University, on July 18th†, 1904, I cannot, under the existing law, give the instruction which the hon. Member suggests. The police have no power to take children to a remand home until they have been brought before a magistrate and remanded. I may say, however, that when children are arrested too late to be brought before a magistrate, or on a day when the Courts are not sitting, they are invariably released on bail, if that course is possible; and that if their detention in the police cells is unavoidable, care is taken to prevent their coming in any way into contact with adult criminals.

Nursing of Sick Poor in Workhouses.

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been drawn to the condition of the nursing of the sick poor in the workhouses, especially in those which contain only a small number of such inmates; what action has been taken, in accordance with the recommendations of the Departmental Committee which reported on this subject in November, 1902; and whether he can give an assurance that early steps will be taken to carry out those recommendations.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) After the Report of the Departmental Committee was issued a considerable number of representations were received by the Department in connection with the recommendations of the Committee, and an Order dealing with the subject is in preparation.

Payment of School Teachers' Salaries.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the fact that certain of the auditors of the Board have informed local education authorities that it is irregular for them to pay on the date in July when the schools close for the summer holidays those salaries which fall due on the 31st July for the previous month or quarter; and whether, having regard to the long-established custom, and to the convenience of all concerned, he can state that no unfortunate consequences will attend the following of the practice this year; and whether, also, he can suggest any method by which irregularity and inconvenience may be avoided in future years.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I am aware that attention has been called to this matter in some of the reports to local education authorities made by one of the district auditors. The Local Government Board have expressed the view that it is competent to a local education authority to make it one of the conditions of employment of a teacher that his salary should in circumstances of the kind mentioned in the Question become payable in advance, and in order to avoid difficulty at the audit they have sanctioned payments made in advance, in so far as they might be open to objection on the ground of the absence of such a condition, at the same time saying that the matter should be put on a proper footing for the future. The Board would be prepared to take the same course in respect of the present year in any other similar cases.

Separation of Church and State in France—British Subjects Affected.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he could state the number of British subjects owning Church property in France who would be affected in case the Bill for the separation of Church and State in France became law, and the religious denominations to which they belonged; and whether any steps have been taken in order to safeguard their interests.

---

† See (4) *Debates,* cxxxviii., 258.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) His Majesty's Embassy in Paris have ascertained that no British subjects would be affected by the passage of the Bill, the object of which is to suppress the "Budget of Public Worship," no part of which can be assigned to persons who are not French.

Chinese Government and the Mackay Treaty.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a reply has been received to the telegram sent by the Foreign Office early in May to His Majesty's Minister at Peking asking him to obtain a detailed statement of the complaints of a large number of British merchants in China that the Government of China ignores the Mackay Treaty, rendering the same ineffective in most essentials, and that the Government of China actively opposes the stipulations of that treaty as to currency, mining taxation, and navigation.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) A reply has been received from His Majesty's Minister at Peking, who has reported that he is sending home with his comments a detailed statement of the complaints of British merchants at Shanghai.

Chinese Coolies in British North Borneo.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will take steps to ascertain the number of Chinese coolies imported into British North Borneo since the company's charter was granted.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The information asked for by the hon. Member could only be obtained by private inquiries on the spot. Perhaps the hon. Member will inform me if there are reasons which would appear to justify the expenditure of time and trouble in procuring it.

Men Invalided from Malta Fever.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state the number of men invalided from Malta fever annually for the ten years from 1895 to 1905; and whether any medical inquiry into the cause of Malta fever has been instituted.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) A Committee, including representatives of the Navy, Army, and Colonial Services, has been making inquiry since June, 1904, into the causation and life history of Malta fever, under the directions and auspices of the Royal Society. Much valuable information has been gained and has been published in interim Reports, which hold out strong hopes of this fever being in the future more successfully grappled with than in the past. The number of men invalided is as follows:—

Year.	Number of Invalids.
†1897	191
1898	149
1899	68
1900	188
1901	163
1902	250
1903	209
1904	191
1905	(Return not yet complete.)

Submarines—Number of Men allowed on Board in addition to Crew.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether Submarine A 8, at the time of the recent casualty, had eight men on board in addition to her ordinary crew; if so, for what purpose; and whether in future some limitation will be placed on the number of extra men permitted to go down in submarines.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) Men under training are invariably taken in addition to the proper crew in the boats running. A limitation as to the numbers taken in addition to crew already exists.

Accidents to Submarines—Methods of Escape for Crews.

SIR JOHN LENG: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fatal disasters to British and French submarines, the Director of Naval

---

† First year in which Mediterranean fever was shown in the Reports as a distinct heading.

Construction will be requested to devise methods of escape for the crews in cases of accident.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) No subject has been more carefully considered at the Admiralty than this, and if a practical fitting for this purpose can be designed it will certainly be fitted.

Delay in Repairing Bridge over the Serpentine.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether he can explain the reason of the delay in repairing the bridge over the Serpentine; and if he can state when the work will be completed.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) It was not advisable to commence the repairs to this bridge during the season, owing to the obstruction which would be caused to the traffic. It is intended to commence them as soon as Parliament rises, and to complete the work by some date in October.

Postmen Acting as Secretaries to Building Societies.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Postmaster-General if he can see his way to rescind the order under which a postman is not allowed to act as secretary to a building society.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am afraid I do not see my way to rescind the rule in question, which for many reasons I consider a salutary one.

Education Regulations—Removal of Log Book.

MR. ERNEST GRAY: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the terms of Schedule IV. (1) (a) of the Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools prohibit the removal of the log book from the school to the place where the managers or local education authority hold their usual meetings, or whether the prohibition applies only to the hours during which the school is open for the instruction of scholars.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The log book must be kept at the school, but there would be no objection to its temporary removal when required at meetings of the managers or of the local education authority.

Erection of Derrycroff Bridge on Mitchell Estate, County Mayo.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution of the Mayo County Council as to the necessity for the erection of the Derrycroff Bridge, on the Mitchell Estate, county Mayo, situate on the road leading from Tourmakeady to Westport; and whether, seeing that it would benefit a large number of people, he will use his influence with the Congested Districts Board with a view to its erection at once.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The proposed bridge would not be on any estate belonging to the Congested Districts Board. It is understood that it would be erected over a public road. The question of its erection is, therefore, for the county council to determine.

Education of Children in Ceylon.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Commissioners appointed by the Governor of Ceylon to inquire into and report on the best method of increasing the education of coolie children, and the children of other labouring classes, in Ceylon, have completed their labours; if not, when will their task be concluded, and a Report furnished.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The Governor informs me that the Commission is expected to report at the end of this month.

Army Staff Appointments—Extension of Time of Assistant Adjutant-General.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that, under the Royal Warrant of 1890, the term of a staff appointment is limited to five years, he will explain why the Assistant Adjutant-General at the War Office who has recently completed this period has been retained in his appointment, and for what period has he been given an extension; and whether, seeing that this officer has served continuously on the staff at the War Office for a period of sixteen years, he will say what are the special circumstances for such exceptional preferment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) At the time of the appointment of the officer alluded to as Assistant Adjutant-General for Recruiting, the Royal Warrant laid down that the term of a staff appointment would be for five years, save under exceptional circumstances. This officer, who lost a leg in Egypt in 1885, held the appointment at the time when, in accordance with the recommendations of the Esher Committee, a change was made in the organisation of the recruiting department, and in the exceptional circumstances then obtaining, the Army Council approved the extension of his time for three years.

Gambling Operations in Cotton.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that the late official investigation of the American Government Department of Agriculture has shown that the bull and bear financial panics of 1900–1901, 1903–4, and again in 1905, which have occurred on the Liverpool and American Cotton Exchanges during those years, were indirectly caused by the manipulation of the Government figures representing the various cotton reports, acreage, and estimates of yields, by officials of the American Government Department who were, it is alleged, in secret compact with the exchange bulls and bears, and that it was their joint gambling operations in options and future fictitious contracts on the Liverpool and American Cotton Exchanges that caused the dislocation of the cotton trade of the world generally and particularly that of Lancashire; and whether, in view of the effect of these gambling operations on other trades and railway stocks dependent upon the prosperity of the cotton industry, he can inform the House what measure His Majesty's Government intends to take to prevent a recurrence of the results of those gambling international operations.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am advised that, apart from newspaper reports, there is no official information at the disposal of the Government relating to the circumstances detailed in the Question. The Government do not contemplate submitting any proposals to Parliament upon the subject.

Minister of Commerce.

MR. HOULT (Cheshire, Wirrall): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now see his way to give effect to the proposal contained in His Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne, with reference to the appointment of a Minister of Commerce.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) As stated at Question time to-day, it is proposed to bring in a Bill, which, however, can only pass as a non-contentious measure.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Deal Barracks Theatre.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, in view of the fact that the theatre at Deal within the barrack walls is freely open to the public, on payment, without any kind of introduction, will he state whether steps are being taken to enforce the regulation that the theatre is not open to the public except by introduction.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): There is no regulation restricting admission to theatres in marine barracks, but as these theatres are situated within the barrack enclosure, no one can attend a performance without being first introduced into the barracks.

MR. WEIR: I can assure the hon. Gentleman that persons are admitted without introduction. I have been within the last three days.

MR. PRETYMAN: I suppose the appearance of the hon. Gentleman was such that the sentry did not think it right to stop him. I will take care he is not allowed thus to enter again.

Canada and Continental Emigrants.

Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the contract concluded between the Canadian Government and the Atlantic Trading Company, of Amsterdam, under which the Dominion agrees to pay one pound sterling for every Continental emigrant sent to Canada; whether he has any official information of similar contracts having been concluded with British shipping companies; and, if not, whether he will take any steps in connection with this preference given to a Continental shipping company in the importation of alien immigrants into Canada.

Mr CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): Is not this a question of purely domestic policy, in which this House has no right to interfere with the action of the Canadian Government? Is the right hon. Gentleman also aware that this subject has been discussed in the Canadian House of Commons, and that the course pursued by the Canadian Government received the approbation of a very large majority of the Members?

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): The hon. Member for Galway has saved me the trouble of answering the Question on the Paper. I could not have put my reply more incisively.

Macedonian Financial Reforms.

Mr. LYELL (Dorsetshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the system of European financial control in Macedonia, as outlined by Lord Lansdowne on March 28th, continues to be the policy of His Majesty's Government; and, if so, whether pressure will be put upon the Ottoman Government in order to secure the acceptance of that system without further delay.

Mr. LYELL: I beg also to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Turkish Government has declined to accept the system of European control of Macedonian finance advocated by the Powers.

Captain ELLICE (St. Andrews Burghs): At the same time may I ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Sublime Porte has refused to adopt the scheme of international control of the finances of Macedonia; and what steps it is proposed to take in order to enforce compliance.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): I think the hon. Member's Question was placed upon the Paper before the speech made by Lord Lansdowne in another place on Tuesday, in which he explained the system of financial control demanded by the Powers. The Turkish Government have declined to accept the system. The Answer to the first paragraph of the Question of the hon. Member for St. Andrews Burghs is in the affirmative. As regards the last paragraph, it would be premature to make any statement with regard to action which might become necessary in the event of a persistent refusal by the Porte to sanction measures which the Powers are unanimous in regarding as indispensable for the tranquillity and good government of Eastern Europe.

The Wattstown Colliery Disaster.

Mr. T. RICHARDS (Monmouthshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, having regard to the number of lives lost in the disaster which occurred at the Wattstown Colliery on the 11th instant, to the fact that only one person working in the mine where the explosion took place escaped, and the frequency with which these unfortunate accidents occur, he does not deem it advisable to order a formal investigation into the causes and circumstances of the explosion, under Section 45 of the Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887, by a "competent person," who shall, in addition to inquiry into the cause and circumstances of the explosion, also inquire into and report as to whether some method or scheme cannot be found for facilitating the efforts o those who on all these occasions are so ready to undertake the work of rescue.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): It is, of course, of great importance that all the facts in connection with the explosion should be fully ascertained, and to this end I have appointed counsel to represent the Department at the inquest. I think there are no reasons for supposing that the inquiry before the coroner will not be full and complete. What further steps it may be necessary for me to take as a result of the inquiry I cannot say until I have received the reports of counsel and the mines inspector. The latter part of the hon. Member's Question refers, I presume, to the provision of apparatus which would enable the rescuers to breathe in bad air. There are several kinds of apparatus for this purpose already in existence, and I may refer the hon. Member on the question to the Report made by Dr. Haldane in 1896 on the causes of death in colliery explosions.

MR. T. RICHARDS asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the anticipated unsatisfactory reply of the Home Secretary, an early opportunity would be given for discussing the Home Office Vote. If not, he should move the adjournment of the House, as this was an urgent matter of public importance. They had 500,000 men going down into the mines every day, and——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is only entitled to ask a Question.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid.) asked for more definite information as to the provision of apparatus and appliances at the mines.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I cannot say definitely what apparatus can be supplied, but the question is under consideration, and we will endeavour to hasten the matter.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Will there be an inquiry following the coroner's inquest?

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: That will depend on the reports I receive from counsel and from the inspector of mines.

MR. T. RICHARDS: I press the Prime Minister for a reply to my Question.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): In view of the obvious and reasonable desire of hon Gentlemen on this side to ascertain the intentions of the Government with regard to these coal mine disasters, does the right hon. Gentleman not see the necessity of allowing the usual three extra days for Supply, one of which might be devoted to the Home Office Vote?

SIR ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorganshire, E.): There is very strong feeling in South Wales in favour of further inquiry, and I therefore hope we shall have an opportunity of discussing the matter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I would remind the House that at the special request of the Opposition and the Irish Members we are taking Irish Supply on Tuesday next and the Colonial Office Vote on next Thursday. I shall be glad, of course, to receive any representation with regard to Supply for the following week. Indeed, if I get a recommendation from the official representatives of hon. Gentlemen opposite, I shall be glad to modify the programme so as to substitute the Home Office Vote for the Colonial Vote.

Post Office and the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, having regard to the fact that the Committee on Public Acounts in their Second Report, recently issued, call attention to a proposed expenditure on account of the Post Office of a sum of £185,470 for which no details have been rendered, will he state the nature and locality of the works where the bulk of this money will be expended.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The hon. Member's Question refers to the paragraph in the Second Report of the Public Accounts Committee which deals with Sub-heads K and O of Vote 7, Class 1 (the Vote for Revenue Buildings), in the Estimates for the year 1903–4. I am not responsible for that Vote; but I may point out that the nature and locality of the works carried out under these sub-heads, and the exact amount expended upon each in 1903–4, are given in the Appropriation Accounts for that year, pages 64 to 79.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): The noble Lord says he is not responsible for this Vote, but is not his subordinate?

LORD STANLEY: No; the Board of Works do the work for us.

Standard Form of Accounts for Local Authorities — Appointment of Committee.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Departmental Committee to consider the practicability of a standard form of accounts being prescribed for local authorities has now been appointed; and whether it has begun to take any evidence on the subject.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The appointment has not yet been made, but I am in communication with the bodies interested in the matter and I hope the arrangements will shortly be completed.

MR. COHEN: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the appointment of this Committee was promised by his predecessor more than six months ago and confirmed by himself a little later?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am aware of that, and the hon. Member has some cause of complaint. I must, however, ask him to have a little patience. There shall be no more delay if I can help it.

Redistribution—The Population Limit.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the fact that by changing 18,500 to 25,000, as the proposed population limit for the disfranchisement of boroughs, and 75,000 to 65,000, as the population limit for the disfranchisement of double-Member constituencies, and by providing that no county or borough with more than two Members shall have its representation reduced to less Members than the integer obtained by dividing its population by 50,000, the number of the Members of the House will be left unaltered at 670, whilst the English counties of Cornwall, Devon, Lincoln, Norfolk, Somerset, and Wilts would not be deprived of one Member each; and whether, in view of the advantage thus obtained, he would be prepared to recommend the amendment of the scheme on the lines indicated.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I replied on Monday † to a similar Question put to me by the hon. Member on this subject, but the modification now made in the terms of the Question and some explanation which he has been so good as to send me, render necessary a modification in the Answer. I think that the plan which he now proposes would have the result which he anticipates subject to this, that when the borough of Stafford, the population of which is under 25,000, had been merged in the county, the population of the county would entitle it under Rule 3 of the Government scheme to eight Members instead of to the seven now allotted to it. Consequently the effect of the hon. Member's proposal would seem to be to increase the number of Members of the House by one. I could not give any promise that the Government scheme would be amended on the lines indicated.

Redistribution Statistics.

MR. TOULMIN (Bury, Lancashire): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board when he proposes to lay upon the Table the statement containing further figures on the subject of Redistribution.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The issue of this statement does not appear to be urgent at the present moment now that the Resolution relating to Redistribution has been withdrawn, and, as it will be both bulky and full of detail, I think it desirable that more time should be given to revising it before it is published.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Yes, put it off five or six years.

Sale of the Whitworth Estate Coalfield.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade if he has any official information to the effect that the sale of the Whitworth Estate Coalfield, near Neath, in South Wales, 6,000 acres in extent, to a German syndicate, on behalf of the German Navy, is being negotiated; and, in such case, if he will have the purchasers warned of the special legislation contemplated by the Government to prevent the coal being shipped for the use of foreign Powers.

---

† See page 879.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. BONAR LAW, Glasgow, Blackfriars): My hon. and gallant friend must not assume that the mere shipping of coal for the use of foreign Powers in the ordinary course of trade has ever been objected to by this or any other Government. What we should object to is the acquisition of anything in the nature of a monopoly of steam coal under the control of foreigners or of a foreign Government. We have no official information about the particular coalfield referred to, which it is understood has been in the market for some time, and has hitherto not produced steam coal.

COLONEL LUCAS (Suffolk, Lowestoft) asked whether, having regard to the importance of the matter, further inquiries would be made.

MR. BONAR LAW: Yes, Sir.

SIR LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.) reminded the hon. Member that on Tuesday last the Secretary to the Admiralty stated that he believed no such purchase had been completed, and it was extremely doubtful whether any such purchase was likely. Did that statement apply to this particular coalfield?

MR. BONAR LAW: I cannot say. The hon. Member must put that Question to the Secretary to the Admiralty.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the Government consider the propriety of reviving the old law which made aliens incapable of acquiring landed estates in this country?

[No Answer was returned.]

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) asked the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention had been drawn to the official announcement made in the morning papers that the purchase of the Whitworth Coalfield had been completed on behalf of a syndicate in which German financiers had a paramount interest; on what authority did the hon. Gentleman make the statement a few days ago that he regarded the purchase as improbable; whether he had any further information which would lead him to modify his views on the subject; and what steps, if any, the Government intended to take in the matter.

MR. PRETYMAN: My attention has been called to this statement; but I see no reason to modify the views which I expressed in the House two days ago. The particular district in which the property alleged to have been purchased is situated is outside the area in which the steam coal suitable for naval purposes has been found. It is quite evident from the figures of the purchase price which have been quoted that the transaction is of an ordinary character, and it does not appear to call for any interference.

MR. DALZIEL said that the question of the quality of the coal had no relation to the statement of the Secretary of the Admiralty the other day, when he said he regarded it as totally improbable that the Whitworth Collieries would be purchased. Did he adhere to that?

MR. PRETYMAN: That was not the Question the hon. Member asked me, nor the Answer I gave. What I was asked was whether I had any information as to the reported purchase by a German syndicate of a valuable coalfield within the area which is of interest to the British Navy, and I replied that I had no information of any such purchase having been concluded, or likely to be concluded. I was not asked about this particular property, which is outside the area of the steam coal.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that this particular property has been hawked about in London and South Wales for the last twenty years and offered at £10 per acre?

[No Answer was returned.]

Express Trains from the North—Dangerous Footboards.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade if he will call the attention of the railway companies to the narrowness of the footboards of the carriages used in the new express services from the North to Folkestone, Dover, and Deal, and to the amount of space between the footboards and the platform at Deal Station; and will he recommend that such steps be taken in the matter as will prevent the lives of the public being endangered.

Mr. BONAR LAW: I have called the attention of the railway companies concerned to the hon. Member's Question, and I understand that inquiry is being made into the matter.

The Loss of the "Kyber."

Mr. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the suggestions made by the Court of inquiry which recently sat at Penzance, relative to the loss of the "Kyber," in March last; and what steps he proposes to take to give effect to those suggestions.

Mr. BONAR LAW: Yes, Sir. The attention of the Board of Trade has been called to the suggestions made by the Court of inquiry in the case of the "Kyber," and they will receive careful consideration.

The Channel Tunnel.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade if any communications have recently taken place in regard to the construction of the Channel Tunnel between the British and French Governments; and if it is proposed by His Majesty's Government to continue the prohibition which has for so many years prevented the further progress of the works on the British side of the Channel.

Mr. BONAR LAW: I am not aware that any communications have recently taken place or that anything has happened to alter or modify the position which has been assumed with regard to this matter.

Big Ben.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commisssioner of Works, what is the cost of lighting the clock known as Big Ben; and what is the estimated saving by colouring one or more of the dials green as opposed to red.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): The cost of lighting the dials of the clock electrically amounts to £242 for the year. The green light is incidental to the lamp used experimentally, and the cost of current, if it was adopted permanently, would be reduced some 35 per cent. A red colour is impracticable.

Beaufort Castle Shooting Case.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if he can state when the trial will take place of John Scheffer Phipps and Henry Carnegie Phipps, of Beaufort Castle, Inverness-shire, recently committed on a charge of shooting at four men engaged at work on the Beauly River, wounding one man so seriously as to necessitate the removal of one eye, and causing grave injury to the other.

The LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton): Owing to the condition of the injured man Fraser, I am not yet able to state the date of the trial.

Limerick Money-Lending Case.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to a case heard in Limerick a few weeks ago where a Mr. Gaffee, who is a Jew, summoned a woman for the payment of a sum of £3, that the woman declared in her evidence, previous to attacks made upon Mr. Gaffee by the Rev. Mr. Creagh, C.C., she was paying weekly instalments of 3s.; whether, seeing the Court reduced the amount sued for to £1 16s. to be paid in instalments of 3d. per week, and the fact that Gaffee has been seriously injured in business by the attacks of the priest, he can say what steps, if any, he proposes taking in the matter.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): I have made inquiries, but have been unable to ascertain that any such case was heard in any of the Limerick Courts recently. If my hon. friend will inform me more precisely when, and in what Court, the case was heard, I will make further inquiry.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick) asked if the police had been directed to make inquiries into this case?

MR. ATKINSON: No, Sir.

MR. SLOAN: Was not the hon. Member for Limerick himself a member of the Court?

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): How much of the claim represented usury?

MR. JOYCE: I was at the Court. As a matter of explanation, may I say I object to the introduction of the Rev. Father Creagh's name into the case. It has nothing to do with the merits. Taking into account the poverty of the woman and the amount she had paid, I made the order of 3d. a week and should do so again in like circumstances.

MR. SLOAN: In view of that statement, will the right hon. Gentleman inquire further?

MR. ATKINSON: I have made all the inquiries I can.

Roscommon Assizes—Case of William Reid.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he directed the Crown Prosecutor to enter a *nolle prosequi* in the case of Crown against Reid at the last Roscommon Assizes; and if he can state how many jurors were challenged by the Crown at the two trials of William Reid at Roscommon and Galway.

MR. ATKINSON: The Answer to the first inquiry is in the affirmative. Owing to the death of the Crown Solicitor who had charge of this prosecution, I am unable at present to procure the necessary information to enable me to answer the latter inquiry.

MR. HAYDEN: Why was a *nolle prosequi* entered in this case?

MR. ATKINSON: Two trials have already proved abortive, and it was anticipated that a third would only lead to the same result.

Cork Assizes—Case of Jeremiah Colbert.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that at the Cork Summer Assizes on 15th instant, in the case of Jeremiah Colbert, charged with a Whiteboy offence, thirty-nine jurors were ordered to stand by; whether he can say how many of these jurors are Catholics; and whether the action of the prosecuting counsel in this case had the sanction of the Law Officers of the Crown.

MR. ATKINSON: Thirty-six jurors were ordered to stand aside. Having received from the Crown Solicitor, who is the person responsible, a report stating the grounds on which he acted, I entirely approve of the course taken. I am unable to give any information as to the religion of these thirty-six jurors, as the Crown Solicitor informs me he does not know what their religion was, nor did he make any inquiries.

MR. FLYNN: Are we to understand that so long as the right hon. and learned Gentleman occupies his present position he intends to continue this invidious practice?

MR. ATKINSON: I intend to carry out the law as far as I can.

Colonel Warden, of Sneem.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Colonel Warden, of Derryquin, Sneem, is at present receiving police patrols; and whether, seeing that Colonel Warden has sold his estate to the tenants, he can state why these patrols are maintained.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): Colonel Warden is not now receiving special police protection, by patrol or otherwise.

Major French's Roscommon Estate.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board has taken any steps to enlarge the smaller holdings on Major French's estate at Clooniquin, county Roscommon; whether all the grass lands on the estate are available for distribution among the small tenants, and, if so, when may the allotment be expected; and whether any of the land is held on the eleven months system; and, if not, upon what tenure do persons in occupation of the grass lands hold.

MR. WALTER LONG: When this estate has been legally vested in the Board, they intend to enlarge the small holdings on it by the distribution of the untenanted land. Pending the completion of the legal steps, the untenanted land has been temporarily let to the Board, who have taken in cattle to graze on it.

Dundonald Cemetery, Belfast.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Jewish community of Belfast have allotted to them a portion of Belfast cemetery, over the interments in which they exercise discretionary authority, and that similar authority is claimed by the Catholics of Belfast, who number over one-fourth of the population of that city, in regard to the ground allotted to them in the new cemetery at Dundonald; and whether, seeing that the corporation of Belfast has refused to admit the Catholic claim, he will take steps, as President of the Local Government Board, in view of the urgency of the question, to insure the admission of the claim without further delay.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Local Government Board are informed that the Jewish community do not exercise any such discretionary authority as is suggested. The duties of the Board are limited to approving or disapproving of the allocation of the graveyard among the several religious denominations. They have no functions in regard to the arrangements as to interments which may be made between the burial board and the different religious bodies.

Constable Finnigan's Transfer from Coalisland to Longford.

MR. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Constable Finnigan's recent transfer from Coalisland to county Longford was the result of charges preferred against him; and, if so, can he state the nature of the charges, the names of the persons who made them, and how they were investigated.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Inspector-General directed the transfer of this constable in the interests of the public service and at the public expense. He was not transferred on punishment.

Coalisland—Assault on John McManus.

MR. DOOGAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, on 1st instant, at Coalisland, John McManus was assaulted in the presence of the police and a number of civilians by Robert Roach and Joseph Marshall; and, if so, can he explain why MacManus was summoned and fined, whilst no proceedings were taken against his assailants.

MR. WALTER LONG: McManus, who was drunk, deliberately obstructed a drumming party, and after being removed by the police, attempted to repeat the obstruction, whereupon he received a blow from one of the party. McManus was prosecuted and fined for drunkenness. He informed the police that he himself would prosecute for the assault. The police do not intend to prosecute, having regard to the trivial nature of the assault, and to the fact that McManus was the aggressor.

Coalisland—Attack on Harkin's House.

Mr. DOOGAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if it has come to his knowledge that the police of Coalisland are in the possession of the names of twelve persons who took part in an attack on Harkin's house on June 3rd last, the name of a man who fired a revolver shot, the names of persons who beat James Bradley and Patrick Cullen, and also with the names of respectable witnesses who can identify all the persons on the police list; and whether, in the interests of peace in the locality, and as a deterrent against another outbreak in Coalisland, he will direct the police to make further inquiries, and to prosecute all the rioters whose identification can be established.

Mr. WALTER LONG: I beg to refer to my reply to the hon. Member's Question of June 26th†. It is not the case that the police have obtained evidence as to the offenders in the attack on Mr. Harkin's house, or in the firing of shots. Summonses for assault were issued by aggrieved persons on both sides, but withdrawn. The police did not witness the assaults. Every possible inquiry was made by the police at the time of the occurrence and no further steps appear necessary.

Mr. FLYNN: Are we to understand that although a large number of persons were concerned in this matter no evidence can be procured?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I said the police did not think any further steps necessary.

Trinity College Lands.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any lands held directly or let on lease by Trinity College have yet been sold under the Act of 1903; and whether it is proposed to take any steps to hasten sales of Trinity College lands.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Proceedings for the sale of two estates of which Trinity college is the direct landlord have been instituted before the Estates Commissioners, and these estates will be taken up in order of priority. The Commissioners have no record of the estates in which the College may be indirectly interested, either as lessor or as owner of superior interests.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman say where these two estates are situated?

Mr. WALTER LONG asked for notice.

Mr. FLAVIN: Can the right hon. Gentleman give us the terms of the sales?

Mr. WALTER LONG: Not without notice.

Tralee Evicted Tenants.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether two evicted tenants, William O'Neill and Bryan Sheehy, on the estate of Arthur Blennerhasset, Tralee, which is being sold, are to be reinstated in their farms; and whether the landlord will be asked to do so before the sale is sanctioned by the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The purchase agreements which have recently been lodged in regard to this estate do not include agreements by the evicted tenants named. The claims of any evicted tenants who apply for reinstatement will be considered when the estate is inspected.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Will the hon. Gentleman undertake the estate shall not be sold until the claims of these tenants have been considered?

Mr. WALTER LONG: No, Sir.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Are their claims to be totally ignored?

Mr. WALTER LONG: No, Sir.

Royal Irish Constabulary—Instructions as to the Use of Truncheons.

*Mr. MULDOON (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland in what form have the specific instructions to the Royal Irish Constabulary in reference to the use of their truncheons on the heads of civilians been conveyed; where the terms of such instructions may be seen; and whether he has any objection to lay them upon the Table of the House.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxlviii., 101.

MR. WALTER LONG: The instructions are contained in the disciplinary code regulating the conduct and action of the police. This code has always been treated as a confidential document and its production refused. The responsibility of the police to members of the public depends on the law of the land and not on the provisions of the code.

Carroll v. Masterson and Another.

*MR. MULDOON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any objection to procure from the learned Judge who tried the case of Carroll *v.* Masterson and another, in the High Court of Justice in Dublin on May 17th and 18th last, a copy of his lordship's notes of the evidence given in that case, and lay the same upon the Table of the House.

MR. WALTER LONG: The application is, I understand, absolutely unprecedented. I have no right to make such a demand, and I am unable to understand for what object the information is desired or what purpose it could serve.

*MR. MULDOON: Will the right hon. Gentleman lay on the Table the depositions taken in the case by his own Crown Solicitor?

MR. WALTER LONG: Certainly not.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Did not Justice Holmes in 1872 lay his charge before Parliament?

MR. WALTER LONG: I am not aware, and I do not see how that arises out of the Question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Oh, yes, the right hon. Gentleman said there was no precedent. I have given him one. I am enlarging the horizon of his ignorance.

Captain Sandes' Estate, Queen's County

*MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the estate of Captain Sandes, Garrymore, Mountmellick, Queen's County, is before the Estates Commissioners for sale; can he say how many evicted tenants on the property have sent in claims for reinstatement; and what steps are being taken to restore them to their holdings or otherwise provide for them.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Answer to the first inquiry is in the negative. Three evicted tenants have sent in claims for reinstatement which will be considered if the estate should come before the Commissioners.

H. J. McFarlane's Estate.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the estate of Henry J. McFarlane, which has been in the Land Judge's Court for twenty-five years past, was transferred to Mr. Justice Meredith by the present Land Judge on account of the personal relations which Mr. Justice Ross had with the matter; that Mrs. Ross has since 1900 prevented the sale to the tenants taking place because she could not secure the entire sporting rights, and that Mr. Justice Meredith more than a year ago made an order directing the solicitor having carriage to put up the sporting rights as a separate lot, which order was upheld by the Court of Appeal, and that since then nothing has been done; and whether, seeing that five-sixths of the holdings on this estate are under £5 valuation, and that the lands over which the sporting rights are claimed would be essential for the purposes of enlargement of holdings, grazing, and reclamation by these tenants he can take any steps to secure that the tenants shall no longer be deprived of the opportunity of becoming the proprietors of their holdings.

MR. WALTER LONG: Mrs. Ross, whose estate almost surrounds the McFarlane Estate, took some years ago, before her husband became a Judge, a lease, under the Court, of some bog and rough warren on the latter estate with the shooting rights over it. When Mr.

Justice Ross was appointed Judge, he refused to act as Receiver Judge over this matter, and it was transferred to Mr. Justice Meredith. It had previously been managed under Mr. Justice Boyd. When the incumbrancers proposed to sell to the tenants, they asked Mrs. Ross to buy the portion of which she had a lease, and she made an offer of £740, which the incumbrancers were willing to accept. Some of the tenants refused to buy unless they got the game rights, but that difficulty, I believe, was surmounted. The tenants' offers were accepted without giving them game rights, and Mr. Justice Meredith ordered that the game rights and the rough warren comprised in Mrs. Ross's lease should be sold by auction. The delay has not been caused by Judge or Mrs. Ross, but by the action of the tenants themselves, and by unforeseen difficulties which have arisen with regard to the title and boundaries. Steps are now being taken to carry out the Judge's order, and it is expected that the matter will be concluded within a short time. I have no power to interfere in the manner suggested.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Is it the fact that the case has been in the Land Judge's Court twenty-five years? Cannot the right hon. Gentleman recommend Judge Ross to facilitate its settlement?

MR. WALTER LONG: I understand it is in process of settlement. I think the Judge has taken the right and proper course in abstaining from interference.

MR. DELANY: What number of years purchase did Mrs. Ross pay?

MR. WALTER LONG: I cannot say.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Fourteen.

Irish Mixed Schools.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have taken into their consideration the statement and resolution which the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, with the Cardinal Archbishop of Armagh in the chair, adopted on the 14th ult., in opposition to the policy of amalgamating boys' and girls' schools; and, if so, whether the Commissioners propose to make any modification of the rules to which the Catholic hierarchy have taken objection.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am informed that the statement and resolution referred to were not communicated to the Commissioners, and that consequently they were not formally considered by the Commissioners. The policy of amalgamation is not a new policy, as I have already pointed out that before the adoption of the new rules there were as many as 2,247 mixed national schools under Roman Catholic management. At the meeting of the Commissioners held on April 28th last the Bishop of Kildare's amendment to Rule 186 (the chief rule on this subject) was unanimously accepted by the Board. The Board do not propose to make any further modification of the rule.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Am I to infer that the National Board were not aware of this resolution of the hierarchy because it was not officially communicated to them?

MR. WALTER LONG: Although it was not formally communicated to them I have no doubt they had cognisance of it from the Press, and no doubt it was in their minds when they came to a decison. I imagine they read the newspapers like other people.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: The Prime Minister never does.

Tobacco-growing in Ireland.

*MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the amount of profit realised from the sale of the produce of twenty acres of tobacco, grown on the estate of Colonel Everard last year, under the auspices of the Board of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, after deduction of all costs of cultivation and curing, including also the estimated rent of land, rates, taxes, and interest on the capital sum of

£1,728 expended on the erection of a tobacco barn by the Department.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The Department are not yet in possession of the necessary information to enable this Question to be answered. I shall be glad to send the hon. Member a specimen of the tobacco.

*Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: Seeing that nearly £5,000 has been spent on these tobacco-growing experiments in Ireland, I think some information should be available.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Certainly. But, as the hon. Member knows, the experiment was carried out with considerable difficulty, and it is not desirable we should communicate results until we have reached a more definite stage than at present.

Irish Teachers' Salaries.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the total saving by the Education Office as the difference between the old salaries paid to teachers and the new.

Mr. WALTER LONG: There is no saving. On the contrary, the teachers now receive in incomes from the State about £50,000 per annum more than they received prior to the introduction of the new system of payments.

Mr. SLOAN: Does that take into account the £28,000 coming out of the Government grant for assistant teachers?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I cannot say without notice.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there is no difference in initial salaries of assistant teachers and principals of national schools, except in capitation, between the smallest country school and the largest city school under the new rules; and whether, seeing the Commissioners' rules provide that a teacher appointed to an important school will receive special consideration, he will carefully consider any such cases submitted to him.

Mr. WALTER LONG: All teachers on entering the service are placed in the third grade, and, of course, receive the initial salary of that grade. But the total incomes, including the residual capitation grant, as well as the prospects of promotion, are better in the case of teachers originally appointed to the larger schools. The matter referred to in the latter inquiry is for the consideration of the Commissioners.

Arterial Drainage in Ireland.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state what steps, if any, he has taken towards appointing Commissioners to inquire into the subject of arterial drainage in Ireland; and, if so, what are their names and qualifications and the terms of their reference.

Mr. WALTER LONG: I have no further statement to make in this matter at present.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR: Can the right hon. Gentleman give us any good reason for not coming to the opinion that he is humbugging the House and the country?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I can give an admirable Answer to that extraordinary Question. I shall shortly announce the names of the Commissioners and the terms of reference.

Estates Commissioners and the Evicted Tenants.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can cause the issue of an instruction to the Estates Commissioners, directing them to give precedence to sales of estates the landlords of which have dealt fully and fairly with the evicted tenants.

Mr. WALTER LONG: No, Sir. It would be quite impossible to differentiate in the manner suggested.

Provision for Afflicted Children in Ireland.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to the Bill for the Relief of Afflicted Children in that country, whether the contribution to be made out of moneys voted by Parliament is to be charged on the Development Fund Grant, or out of the usual grant for national education, or whether it is, as it has been in England and Scotland since the year 1893, a special and separate grant out of voted moneys.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The provision to be made for this service will not be charged on the Development Grant, but in the annual Estimates. If the Bill passes in its present form, as I hope it will, the Estimate for Public Education will bear the charge.

Mr. CLANCY: Is it to come out of the education grant?

Mr. WALTER LONG: No, it will be an addition to the existing provision.

Roman Catholic Priests and Income-Tax.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if the whole clerical income of the Roman Catholic Church in the United Kingdom is free from income-tax.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): No, Sir, the Roman Catholic clergy enjoy no special exemption from income tax.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Do the hon. Member for South Belfast and his friends pay any rent for the use of the Custom-house steps at Belfast?

[No Answer was returned.]

Abbeyleix Gun Licence Case.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the Abbeyleix Petty Sessions, held on 24th June, a man, named John Devoy, was prosecuted by the Excise authorities for carrying a gun along the public road to a detached farm of his, not having at the time a 10s. licence, and the magistrates dismissed the case on the grounds that defendant was exempt under Sub-section (4) of Section 7 of The Gun Licensing Act, 1870, under which the prosecution was brought; and whether, seeing that the supervisor who prosecuted appealed in Court from the magistrates' decision, and withdrew the appeal in a week afterwards, he will give directions that in future prosecutions shall not be taken against occupiers of land whilst carrying guns to and from their land for the purpose of protecting their crops.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): I am informed that the proceedings, to which the hon. Member refers, were instituted as the evidence showed a *prima facie* case of breach of the Gun Licence Act. The desire of the Board of Inland Revenue is to avoid unnecessary proceedings against occupiers of lands who may be carrying guns for the purpose stated in the Question.

Irish National Schools—Building Plans.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the proposed new plans for national schools in Ireland have now been approved of; and, if so, can he state when they will be issued.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to him on this subject on the 12th † instant.

Mr. BOLAND: I will repeat the Question this day week.

Buncrana and the Telephone Service.

Mr. MULDOON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General why it was that Buncrana was not included in the Derry telephone area; whether any representations have been made to him on this subject; and whether he can see his way to have this town included at an early date.

Lord STANLEY: I am not aware that the question of the inclusion of Buncrana in the Londonderry telephone exchange area was raised when the area was specified for the National Telephone Company. Several applications for the inclusion of Buncrana in that area have been received since the passing of the Telegraph Act of 1899, but my predecessor and I have felt unable to assent to so large an extension of the National Telephone Company's area as would be involved in the inclusion of Buncrana in the Londonderry area. I am, however, prepared to open a Post Office exchange there and to provide a trunk connection with Londonderry if adequate support is forthcoming.

---

† See page 402

Fermoy and the Telephone Service.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the necessity of extending telephonic facilities to the town of Fermoy, by the establishment of an exchange and its connections with the trunk line system, having regard to the importance of the town as a business centre and military station; and whether, seeing that the National Telephone Company would be willing to grant the required facilities, but are prevented in consequence of some agreement with the Post Office which has placed Fermoy and district within a restricted area, he proposes to take any, and, if any, what action in the matter.

Lord STANLEY: My attention has been called to the desire for telephone facilities at Fermoy. The cost of connecting Fermoy with the trunk wire system would, however, be considerable, and at present there does not appear to be enough support to justify the undertaking. I shall, however, be glad to be furnished with the names of those who are willing to become subscribers to an exchange at Fermoy, and if a sufficient number are sent in I will arrange for a canvass of the town to be made.

Irish Trade Statistics.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether, in preparing statistics for the trade of 1906, he will give instructions with a view to securing that the trade between Ireland and Great Britain be set out separately.

Mr. BONAR LAW: The Customs have no means of obtaining complete statistics of the trade between Ireland and Great Britain, there being no power to require the necessary particulars to be supplied. I understand that the question of compiling such information on the subject as can be obtained is at present engaging the attention of the Irish Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.

Mr. LOUGH: Is there any objection to acquiring the necessary legal authority?

[The Answer was inaudible.]

Mr. JOYCE: Does not the Board of Trade get the information from the harbour authorities in Ireland?

Mr. BONAR LAW: I understand that is the source from which the Irish Board of Agriculture get the information.

Mr. JOYCE: And the Board of Trade can get it in the same way.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN: Why distinguish between the trade of Ireland with foreign countries and that with Great Britain? Why cannot you get those returns?

Mr. BONAR LAW: The Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs the other day said the information was not available so far as foreign Powers was concerned.

Mr. FLAVIN: If the Irish Board of Agriculture has the right to demand the information from the Irish harbour authorities why does not the Board of Trade do it?

Mr. BONAR LAW: We have not the power.

Mr. FLAVIN: Yes, you have.

Mr. JOYCE: I am a member of a harbour authority and know that our clerk has to supply the information.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Oh, what do they know about Ireland?

Minister of Commerce.

Mr. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will now state whether it is his intention of introducing this session the measure promised in His Majesty's Speech from the Throne for raising the *status* of the Local Government Board and the Board of Trade, and creating a Minister of Commerce.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Bill is ready, and I desire to introduce it. But whether it has any chance of passing will, of course, depend on the general approval it meets with on both sides of the House, for it would be impossible to press it through as a controversial measure.

Redistribution—The Boundary Committee or Commission.

Sir HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Committee or Commission upon Redistribution boundaries which the Government propose to set to work will be limited by their instructions to the lines of the Resolution which has been withdrawn, or whether their instructions will permit them to take into consideration other alternatives or amendments; and also, whether, having regard to the fact that the Government proposals proceed upon the basis of population, he will call for an estimate by the Registrar-General of the probable population of the different constituencies in the year 1906, in which the proposed Redistribution Bill is intended to be introduced.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It is somewhat too early as yet to deal with the points brought forward by my hon. friend, but I can assure him that they will receive the attention of the Government.

Mr. PEEL (Manchester, S.): May I ask whether, in the case of border line constituencies, the right hon. Gentleman will also consider the advisability of allowing the Commissioners to consider the great shifting of population which has recently taken place in consequence of the development of means of communication, which has rendered the old precedents entirely obsolete.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not sure that I admit the last part of my hon. friend's Question but his suggestion will be kept in view.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether one of the reasons which induced the Government to base their proposals for redistribution on population and not on the numbers of electors was to avoid raising the question of the plural voter; whether his attention has been called to the fact that this argument was omitted from the explanatory Memorandum accompanying the proposals; and whether, with a view to providing the House with full materials on which to form its judgment, he will instruct the Committee or other body which he proposes to appoint to inquire, as far as may be, into the number and the distribution of the plural voters.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: We have in this Bill proceeded upon the precedent set in the preceding Redistribution Bills, and I see no reason to depart from them. If the hon. Gentleman desires us to combine with a Redistribution Bill a Reform Bill, that is not the policy of the Government.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Commissioners in 1885 took into consideration not only population, but also the numbers of the electors, mostly plural voters, whose qualifications arose from urban areas? The Commissioners stated then that they kept certain divisions artificially low in order to put in urban voters, who were mostly plural voters.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Baronet is a very great authority on this question, because he was directly concerned in dealing with it in 1885; but I think he will not deny that population and not voting power was, broadly speaking, the basis of the arrangement. The point he has brought to my attention will be kept in mind.

Mr. McKENNA: Will the right hon. Gentleman instruct whatever body he may appoint to inquire into the number of the plural voters in particular districts.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am certainly not going to commit the Government as to the precise nature of the instructions to be given. There may be cases, no doubt, in which inquiry may be desirable, but, so far as I have made up my mind on the subject at all, to state the precise instructions to be given, or the time at which they will be given, would be premature.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: If the hon. Gentleman will look to the Report of the Commissioners he will see it was done in the cases of both Surrey and Middlesex.

Mr. McKENNA: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the body which he has in contemplation to set up before the next session of Parliament, in connection with his proposals for Redistribution, is the same body as that contemplated in the Resolutions; and, if not, in what respect as regards powers and duties the body now proposed differs from that originally intended.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I certainly am not going to pledge myself as to the identity of the body that will now be appointed with the body that would have been appointed had the Resolutions been passed; it is a very hypothetical Question. But there will, do doubt, be a very close relationship.

Mr. McKENNA asked whether the body now proposed to be appointed would be a Boundary Commission, or a Committee with power to advise the Government.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No Commission we can appoint would have powers except to advise the Government; it must ultimately rest with the House of Commons to decide what shall be adopted.

Mr. DALZIEL: May we assume that what is generally understood as a Boundary Commission will subsequently be appointed?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, I do not think the hon. Gentleman must take my Answer as of larger scope than appears on the surface. I do not think there is anything to be gained by stating now the precise terms and exact course to be adopted.

Mr. McKENNA said surely they were entitled to know whether it was proposed to appoint Boundary Commissioners.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know why the hon. Gentleman is more entitled to know it than the House of Commons was in 1884 to know the intentions of Mr. Gladstone.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman has a peculiar tendency to shelter himself under the name of Mr. Gladstone. But in Mr. Gladstone's case, owing to circumstances into which I need not enter, the matter was the subject of arrangement between the two sides of the House, so that there is no analogy whatever.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman is mistaken; the Committee appointed by Mr. Gladstone was appointed before that arrangement.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Yes, but the Commission was appointed afterwards.

Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now see his way to proceed with the Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill, especially in view of the fact that it is unanimously supported by all Highland Members, and has been brought in by the Government no less than four years in succession.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Bill is a very desirable one, but I do not think it is possible to pass it this year.

Mr. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire): Seeing that the opposition from this side is mainly financial, cannot the right hon. Gentleman undertake to furnish funds to enable the object of the Bill to be carried out? Or if he would make a definite promise next year that might remove the objection.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That would involve a new Bill.

Scottish Education Bill.

SIR JOHN TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the time now available, he can give facilities at an early date for completing the remaining stages of the Education (Scotland) Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The progress made in Committee last Friday with the Education (Scotland) Bill was of a very unsatisfactory character, and I see no hope whatever for this Bill except by some mutual arrangement between the two sides of the House. If such an arrangement is possible, I will not say the Bill could not be passed, but evidently the time available for such a purpose would be extremely brief.

QUESTIONS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL called the Speaker's attention to the fact that four of the Questions on the Paper addressed to the Prime Minister—three of them relating to Redistribution—had not been asked or answered, and asked whether this was not an abuse of the spirit of the undertaking which was given when the new rules of procedure were adopted, that Questions addressed to the Prime Minister should be placed in such a position on the Paper that they would be reached before five minutes to three o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member seems to suggest that the Prime Minister has evaded answering the Questions to which he alludes.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Yes, I do.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is not so, for the Questions had not been reached before five minutes to three o'clock, owing probably to the fact that no fewer than twenty-five supplementary Questions have been asked.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN asked what business would be taken next week.

MR. KEIR HARDIE inquired whether the Unemployed Bill would be put down as the second order to-morrow after the Naval Works Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was not possible to act upon that suggestion, because the Amendments of the Government to the Unemployed Bill, which he hoped would make it a non-contentious measure, were not yet on the Paper. The second order to-morrow would be the Scottish Churches Bill, and it would be a great convenience if the first order—the Naval Works Bill—were finished in time to complete the Committee stage of that measure. With regard to next week, he did not know whether it was proposed to carry the debate on the vote of censure through the evening sitting on Monday as well as through the morning sitting.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have not yet sounded the desires of those who sit around me.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that, should the House divide on the vote of censure at half-past seven o'clock, he proposed to take at the evening sitting the Report stage of the Scottish Churches Bill, which it was desirable to pass as soon as possible and send up to another place.

PROTECTION OF LIFE FROM FIRE.

Report from the Select Committee [Inquiry not completed] brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 254.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 254.]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Third Report brought up, and read, with part of the Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 248.]

SUPPLY [15TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

CLASS III.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £83,415, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I think it will be convenient if I state what are the suggestions that the Irish Government are able to offer in order to cope, in some way, at all events, with the block in the Land Commission. In order to do this I will be as brief as possible. It is necessary that I should not only tell the Committee what the present position is, but also remind them what is the history of the Irish Land Act of 1903. The purchase applications which have been received up to date amount to £27,933,000. The Treasury undertook at the time of the passing of the Act to find £5,000,000 a year, and there was an understanding arrived at between the Treasury and the Irish Government that during the first three years that the Act would be in operation there should be not more than £5,000,000 issued in one year. The Treasury loyally carried out their part of the bargain, because in the first year they issued stock to the extent of £5,000,000, which produced £4,337,122. In the second year, owing to the representations of the Member for Dover, as the first issue had failed to produce the amount in cash that the Irish Government had anticipated would have been at their disposal, the Treasury very liberally consented to increase the issue from £5,000,000 to £6,000,000. £6,000,000 was therefore issued, and produced £5,354,352, making a total of £9,691,454, and deducting that from £27,000,000 odd, we had a balance of £18,241,550. We have reason to believe that if it were possible by any just and wise expedient to remove that block, it ought to be possible to deal with from £3,000,000 to £5,000,000 worth of property before January next.

It is quite natural I should be asked why I have not pressed the Treasury to issue another loan before the time agreed upon has expired. I may remind the Committee that up to the present date only twenty-one months have elapsed of the first two years of the Act, so that within those twenty-one months we have received more than the Treasury undertook to provide us with in the first two years. If that Question be asked, the Answer to it, I think, is obvious. If we put aside altogether the question of bargain between the Irish Government and the Treasury, and if it were the case, as I have already shown it is not, that the Treasury has failed to act liberally in response to the demand made by the Irish Government it would still be necessary to consider whether it is desirable to issue another loan of the same character and on the same conditions at the present moment. The Committee must recollect that it is only possible to issue loans for this or any other purpose from time to time as it is probable that they will be freely accepted by the money market. I would also remind hon. Members that whatever may be the inclination in ordinary cases we ought not in this case to condemn the Treasury for acting in a niggardly way or for being unwilling to come to the relief of another branch of Irish Government, solely because the Treasury in this matter have not themselves to think of. The Committee must recollect that upon every issue the guarantee fund, of which the development grant is the first constituent, is responsible for the loss on flotation. The Treasury might if they cared to do so take up the line that it was no business of theirs. The loss would fall upon the Irish Exchequer, and therefore they need not interfere. But there is, apart altogether from this local aspect of the question, a much larger and wider aspect from which the question must be approached and that is the general effect upon the money market. I do not think that anybody will deny that, assuming the conditions which I have described, namely, a deliberate bargain made publicly—not privately—but made publicly on the floor of this House, and frequently referred to since it was made by the Treasury and the Irish Government, and the complete fulfilment of that bargain—I do not think anybody will deny that grave risks would be incurred if the Treasury, without good cause and without obtaining some substantial advantage in return, were to break the bargain publicly made on the floor of the House and throw upon the market another loan which would be altogether unexpected by those likely to take it up. It might have a very serious effect not only upon the value of land stock itself, but upon the general condition of the money market as a whole. Therefore, I have adopted the only course open to me when I acquiesced in the Treasury view and accepted the decision that an extra loan on the ordinary terms could not reasonably be issued at the present time.

I had to ask myself in the circumstances whether it was possible to find any other expedient which would temporarily, at all events, tend to lessen our difficulties. I have examined many suggestions which have been made to me, but I have been driven to the conclusion—and I may say that I have come to this conclusion after prolonged consultation not only with my own advisers but with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the experts at his command—that the only way in which we can, experimentally it may be, attempt to relieve the block is by making an alteration in the Act of 1903. In the Act of 1903 it is made obligatory that all payments in respect of estates shall be in cash. If we were to alter that so as to make it compulsory upon owners of land to take anything else except cash it would be a deliberate breach of the provision of Parliament and ought not to be undertaken by anybody. But there is a middle course which the Government suggest, and it is that the Act of 1903 should be amended so that the compulsion of taking cash should be altered to this extent: that, while the Act remains as it is, there should be amending words introduced in a single-clause Bill to enable the vendors, if they so wish, and only if they so wish, to take a portion of the purchase money in stock. What I propose is that two-thirds of the purchase money should be the maximum to be taken in stock, one-third in cash, the bonus in cash, and the stock to be at its face value. If this plan be adopted, it would probably still be necessary to issue more stock, because, as I have already shown, the funds at our disposal are absolutely exhausted.

When I first became responsible for the Irish Government, all the existing issues and the previous issues had been expended with the exception of about £1,250,000. That £1,250,000 is practically expended at the present time, so that it would still be necessary, from time to time, to make fresh issues in the market. If this plan which I, with great respect, suggest to the House be adopted, it would have the following advantages. In the first place, assuming that a certain proportion of the vendors took advantage of the arrangement, it would enable the landlords and the tenants of the estates affected to complete their bargains at a very early date instead of having to wait, as it may and probably will be, for years before they can hope to get the money to which they are entitled. If it is urged that this is an unexpected development, I am bound to remind the Committee that in all the debates that took place at the time my right hon. friend anticipated that the full working of the Act would take a very considerable period of time. I think he estimated it at probably fifteen years. I do not think anybody is to be blamed for making a forecast which has proved to be so erroneous, because I doubt if anybody at the time the Act was passed contemplated that it would have worked as rapidly as it has done; and, whereas it was anticipated that £5,000,000 would be more than enough in each of the first two years, we find those £5,000,000 are gone before that period, applications having been so numerous. If they continue to come in at the present rate the accumulation of undisposed of applications will be largely increased, and, if we are to deal with these in anything like reasonable time we must have an additional, and it may be a temporary and experimental way of dealing with the difficulty.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): But does not the vendor get any interest on the provisional bargain?

MR. WALTER LONG: Certainly, he gets 3½ per cent. on the purchase price.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Then the operation is not suspended. He is drawing a fair interest all the time.

MR. WALTER LONG: Certainly, it depends upon the bargain he makes with the tenants. *Ad interim*, he gets 3½ per cent. on the purchase money. It is necessary, however, to remember that until the sale is completed his charges cannot be paid off—and therefore the interest upon them remains at whatever figure it has hitherto been—nor does he get the benefit of the bonus, which is only payable when the transaction is completed. Therefore there would be these great advantages. Not only would the arrangements between the landlord and tenant be completed earlier than otherwise, but the vendors would be able to pay off their charges so as to get the benefit of the interest on the balance in the form of income. I believe myself, and I believe the figures I shall give will prove it, that in the long run the loss consequent upon the difference between the face value of stock and cash would not be by any means serious in amount. Including the money already issued, to carry this Act into successful operation involves the issue of £112,000,000 of stock in order that the money may be found. Now the merest tyro of finance must recognise that for the years during which the Act is running it must throw a very heavy liability upon the stock market of this country. With all the good will in the world on the part of the British Exchequer and the investing public, it must inevitably be several years, possibly many years, before vendors can get their money, and if, therefore, they are inclined to take advantage of this new method, then a very great benefit will be conferred not only upon the community in Ireland, but upon the general stock market. If this arrangement were at all largely availed of, while at present we have to be responsible for the issue in the course of the next ten or fifteen years of some £112,000,000 inclusive of the £11,000,000 already issued, it is quite conceivable that that issue might be reduced £50,000,000 or £60,000,000. It is not necessary for me to remind the Committee of the buoyant effect that result would in all probability have upon the stock market of the country as a whole. Therefore, from a local point of view, and from a general point of view, I think I may claim these advantages for the scheme I propose.

Let me remind hon. Gentlemen who sit for Irish constituencies that, if we go on as we are at present, there is a very grave risk, to put it mildly, of the development grant being entirely absorbed. If we can lessen these costs by an expedient such as I have suggested the development grant would be the first to benefit. I do not think it necessary to say a word about this expedient from the point of view of the tenants. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the purchasing tenants will be in no way injuriously affected. On the contrary, the completion of their transactions will be expedited, and, so far as they are concerned, whether the payment is made wholly in cash or in stock is a matter which does not affect them. With regard to the position of the vendors, this is an experiment which may be only of a temporary character, and no vendor can be called upon to take this stock unless he, of his own free will, consents to do so. Therefore, I do not think it can be said that it is a hardship, even though it may be a new departure which they may regard with some suspicion. I admit at once that the Landlords' Convention have considered this matter and decided that they are not in a position to agree to it. Therefore, I make the proposal with the full knowledge that it does not start under very good auspices, and the Government would not have made it had they not felt it was their bounden duty, at all events, to make a proposition to the House which if it commends itself to Parliament will, I believe, result in lessening the block which at present exists.

I will give the Committee a very simple illustration of the effect of the suggested change. I take an estate which is encumbered to about two-thirds of its value. The purchase money is £21,654, and the rate of interest for the interim period 3½ per cent. The present charges amount altogether to £605, which deducted from an income of £758, leaves a nett income during the interim period of £153. Suppose the landlord adopts the suggested change. The sum required to pay off the incumbrances is £11,667. The landlord will receive in cash one-third of the purchase money, £7,218, and a bonus of £2,598, making a total of £9,816, so that to make up the £11,667 there will be required an additional sum of £1,851. To provide this sum by selling stock at 92 he would sell £2,012. The total stock he receives, therefore, is £14,436, of which he will retain £12,424, and the annual income which he will derive in dividends from this stock at 2¾ per cent. is £342. Therefore, while there is a loss in capital value to the landlord, during the three, four, or five years which must elapse before he can get his purchase completed he will have an income of £342 as against £153. The result in another illustration which I might give is that on an estate sold for £29,299, very heavily encumbered, the net income is £6, which by the adoption of this plan would be increased to £257.

Having regard to the immediate pressure in many cases and the urgent necessity of finding some honest and practical way out of the difficulty, I think I may fairly urge that the adoption of this suggestion will carry no injustice to the purchasing tenants, and that while it will inflict some capital loss on the landlord it will give him so great a relief in regard to his immediate receipts that the proposal is worthy of careful consideration. I have every reason to hope that it may not be necessary actually to issue the stock in the course of the coming months. Once in the position of offering cash with stock it means the purchase of more than twice the amount than if cash alone were available. I should then think it my duty to make such arrangements with the Treasury as I could, and avoid, if possible, the issue of stock, and thus prevent the risk of additional loss on flotation. The period to which I have referred is between now and January 1st. I have already obtained from the Treasury very considerable augmentation of the staff of the distributing branches of the Land Commission, and I am also considering with the Lord Chancellor and the Attorney-General what is the best way to deal with the difficulty in the Judicial Commissioner's Court. I think everyone will admit that the work he has done is almost unexampled in amount, and if we can give him assistance we ought to do so. I hope I have made these proposals clear to the Committee. I apologise to the Committee for the time I have occupied, and I further ask that at the hands of the Committee and Parliament they may have fair and unprejudiced consideration.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said the right hon. Gentleman had no need to apologise for the time he had taken, but he had some reason to apologise for the fact that in the concluding days of the session when full discussion was impossible he should propose a fundamental change in the Land Act of 1903. He had said that he made this suggestion after prolonged consultation. Consultation with whom? Not with the representatives of the Irish people in that House.

MR. WALTER LONG: My own officials in the Irish Office.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Quite so; then the right hon. Gentleman had reason to apologise for coming to the House at the end of the session with a scheme without ascertaining the views of those who represented the mass of the Irish people, in the House and outside it—a scheme which necessitated legislation at a time when it could not be at all properly discussed. Into the merits of the proposal he was not entering. This was the first he had heard of it, and he declined to discuss a scheme which was thrown at their heads in this way without any consultation with or intimation to those most deeply interested. If it was to be proceeded with it would have to be by the introduction of a Bill and he, for one, would consent to no Bill dealing with this important subject unless he and his colleagues were afforded ample opportunity for consideration and discussion. They had too often made the mistake of giving way to the stress of the moment and accepting legislation of this kind without discussion. As far as he was concerned he came years ago to the conclusion that no matter how simple a Bill was, and how good its object, he would decline to make himself in any way responsible for its passage without full and adequate discussion. Apart from the merits of the scheme he gave the right hon. Gentleman fair warning that he and his colleagues would not agree to the passage of any Bill without adequate discussion in the House.

But he had a wider objection with regard to the passing of these small amending Acts. The truth was that the working of the Land Act of 1903 had in its essential portion broken down. The right hon. Gentleman was quite correct when he spoke of the rapidity with which the Act was working as judged by the amount of money that had been applied for. But that did not convey an accurate idea as to whether this Act was working successfully or not. What was the primary object of this Bill? It was not merely to facilitate the transfer of land, for that was only the means. The object was to settle the Irish land question and put an end to the Irish land war. The Irish land question was, to a very large extent, centred in the poorer parts of the country where there was congestion on the one side and large depopulated tracts of grazing land on the other. If every estate of the well-to-do were sold tomorrow on fair terms the land question would remain so long as the question of congestion and cattle ranches remained untouched. The working of the Act showed a complete and absolute breakdown in dealing with congestion and the breaking up of grass lands. With regard to the evicted tenants the Act had been equally a failure. But he took a broader objection to the passage of small amending Bills such as that which was now suggested. Until they were in a position to force the Government to give them the opportunity of proposing an amendment of the Act in order to make it work where it was really needed, it would be foolish of them to simply facilitate the hasty transfer of estates in rich parts of Ireland.

The question arose quite recently in connection with the action of the Government itself regarding the issue of new regulations. The House would remember how that matter stood. Until the other day they were unable to elicit the directions and regulations and instructions under which the Estates Commissioners were acting. The Report which the Estates Commissioners issued stated explicitly that instructions had been given to them which had had the effect of fettering their discretion and preventing them from following out the administration of the Act on the lines which seemed best to them, and when they asked for the production of those instructions they were told that they were not instructions in accordance with a certain section of the Act, but were given in official correspondence, and could not be produced. He did not intend to go back on that controversy, although it would be a favourable subject for discussion.

He came now to the new regulations. The right hon. Gentleman promised when he entered office that he would make new regulations; and that they would be placed before Parliament. He had done so, and these new regulations completely knocked the bottom out of the Land Act so far as the evicted tenants and the congested districts were concerned. The first regulation the right hon. Gentleman had issued was one which in his judgment ended all possibility of the Estates Commissioners obtaining untenanted land anywhere in Ireland, either for the purpose of restoring evicted tenants or for the improvement and enlargement of holdings. This new regulation provided that the applications in Court should be dealt with on the principle of first come first served. Now that might seem at first sight a fair principle, to lay down, that there should be no distinction between applications, but to anyone who understood the Land Act and how it was working it must appear very different. Of the £28,000,000 applied for up to the present almost all had been applied for under sections of the Act, that was to say, applied for in direct sales between landlord and tenant. In those cases it was impossible for the Land Commissioners to obtain possession of untenanted land. And in the case of all the estates which were being sold direct from the landlord to the tenant, what was the landlord doing? He was dividing his estate up before the sale took place, putting up lots to auction, and selling them to the highest bidder. Then he went to the Land Commissioners and sold the new holdings to them. In very many cases by this process the landlord got paid twice over. That procedure was on foot all over Ireland, with the result that the Land Commission had no chance of getting possession of untenanted land. It was in cases in which the sale took place from the landlord to the Commissioners and from them to the tenants that the Commissioners had the chance of obtaining untenanted land. They could always obtain it by sales through the Land Judge's Court. The new regulation, however, provided that all the cases already in Court which came entirely under Section 1 must have precedence, with the result that it postponed for years and years the possibility of the Commissioners obtaining possession of untenanted land. Thus it constituted an absolute block in the working of the Land Act in the only field in which it might be hoped to carry out its object of settling the Irish land question. He, for his part, would oppose any scheme for facilitating the obtaining of money for this object, so long as there was a regulation in force which compelled the whole of the money to go to the purchase of estates when there was really no land question at all, and which prevented any of the money going to the poorer parts of the country.

It might be asked what he suggested. He admitted it would not be workable to allow absolute discretion to the Commissioners to pick out this estate and that estate and take the applications in any order they pleased. What he suggested was that there should be a fair division of the money made available for each different class of sales. Judge Ross in the Land Judge's Court had complained that the work had come to a standstill, and that it would be absolutely impossible for him to carry out his object of clearing that Court, and the new regulation made that a permanent state of things by forbidding any of his cases to be taken in priority to the £28,000,000 worth of cases already in the hands of the Commissioners under Section 1. He suggested that, in future, if £5,000,000 was devoted to land purchase, a certain proportion should be put on one side to deal with cases in the Land Judge's Court; that the tenth of it, say £3,000,000, should be put aside to deal with direct sales, and the balance be put at the disposal of the Land Commission to deal with cases under Section 6, where they bought direct from the landlord, in which case they could hope to obtain the breaking up of these large grazing farms. Any scheme of that sort would receive from them careful consideration. When a block had been come to and when there were great interests at stake affecting the vast majority of the people of Ireland, it was not reasonable or business-like for the Chief Secretary to come there with a cut-and-dried scheme, after prolonged consultation with a few English officials sent over to the offices in Dublin, without any consultation with the people affected or their representatives. This was an Act amending the Land Act of 1903, not dealing with the really important parts of the Land Act, but providing money to facilitate sales in the richer parts of Ireland where there was no great hardship.

The next regulation was the most extraordinary he had ever heard. He would read a portion of it—

> "In every case in which an application is made to the Estates Commissioners they shall inquire whether any intimidation has been exercised, directly or indirectly, in reference to or in connection with such application or the subject matter thereof, or the estate or land affected thereby."

Would the House seriously consider what that meant? Here was a body of Commissioners consisting of three very able officials, civilians not connected in any way with the law. They had the duty of carrying out the sale of estates and the Executive came along and said to them, "When an application is made to you, you must first inquire whether there has been any intimidation in connection with the application or the land affected?" What was intimidation?

Were the Estates Commissioners to go out like two removable magistrates and hold a Court in the district, and try the question whether there had been intimidation or not? What did intimidation mean? The object of this regulation, in his view, was to intimidate the people. It was to try to bring about the sale of estates all over Ireland without allowing the people anything in the nature of public action or freedom of speech to discuss the Act or the prices under the Act. It seemed to him that this regulation would have the direct effect, if carried out, of intimidating the people. The mere proposal of it was certainly calculated to create an utterly false impression in that House and in the country, because a proposal of this kind could scarcely be justified unless the Government that made it was able to show that there was in the country some widespread system of wrong-doing and intimidation.

The proposal was quite remarkable. The Commissioners were to inquire as to whether there was any intimidation or not. How were they to inquire? Suppose that a local policeman wrote to the Commissioners saying, "I hear that there is a proposal for the sale of such and such an estate. I beg to call your attention to the fact that the enclosed anonymous threatening notice was found posted on a dead wall in the neighbourhood." Was that intimidation? Certainly it was an accusation of intimidation. Was it not ludicrous under these conditions to instruct that an application was to be put on one side, and that Mr. Wrench, Mr. Bailey, and Mr. Finucane were solemnly to go down and hold an inquiry as to whether intimidation was really in existence there or not? They were forbidden to enter into the matter at all until they had satisfied themselves on that matter. Take another case. Suppose that negotiations were going on for the sale of an estate in Tipperary or anywhere they liked—let him say, to make the case a very aggravated one, that the Member for Tipperary went down among his own constituents—an audacious thing for him to do in Ireland—and that he was accompanied by two or three parish priests and other friends of the tenants, and held a meeting at which the question of sale was discussed openly and in preference to the Press; and resolutions were come to saying that the landlord should make this concession, asking that certain other concessions should be made, and inquiring what was the best price that the landlord would take. Of course he knew that might be held to be intimidation under the Coercion Act by two removable magistrates. But was it seriously suggested that on account of a public meeting of that kind to advise the people as to what they were to do in regard to holdings in the neighbourhood, the Commissioners were not to be allowed to entertain applications until they had made inquiry as to whether intimidation had been practised or not? This regulation was a most insulting one, and an unworkable one. It seemed to him that if the Commissioners attempted to carry it out they would be bound to inquire into every expression of public opinion so long as public opinion made itself heard at all. So long as the views of the people were freely heard it would be impossible to carry out any sales at all because the Commissioners would be engaged all their time inquiring into these matters.

The third regulation absolutely prevented the improvement and enlargement of holdings in the first place, and actually prevented the restoration of the evicted tenants in the second place. The first regulation prevented the possibility of the Commissioners getting hold of untenanted lands. The third regulation said that even when they did get posession of untenanted land they could not divide it up in the way suggested, either for the improvement of holdings or the restoration of evicted tenants.

Let him read the third regulation—

> "Having regard to the provisions of Sections 2, 4 and 8 of the Act, and of the enactments repealed by the Act, untenanted lands when purchased by the Estates Commissioners, whether they form part of an estate sold or have been acquired under the provisions of Section 8, should be utilised for the enlargement of the uneconomic holdings of agricultural or pastoral tenants, or for providing lands for the persons, or for the purposes described in Sections 2 and 4 of the Act, and not for the purpose of erecting tenancies for the benefit of, or making allotments to, persons other than those described in the last-mentioned sections."

The persons described in the last-mentioned sections were of four classes —the tenants on the estate, the sons of tenants on the estate, the evicted tenants, and tenants in the immediate neighbourhood whose holdings were under £5 valuation. Up to the issue of these regulations, if his information was accurate, the Commissioners were endeavouring to do what they could in the way of enlargement of holdings and in the way of the migration of tenants irrespective of these limitations. They were forbidden now to go outside these four classes. What did that mean? He did not know if there was anyone on the other side of the House acquainted with the state of things in the immediate neighbourhood of the congested districts in the West of Ireland, but let him take an example from that part of Galway which was much in the public eye at the present moment, and in respect to which the trial was going on of fifty or sixty peasants on charges of unlawful assembly. He might say, incidentally, that it was a district surrounding the Clanricarde Estate, and consisted of a whole series of great cattle ranches. There were no tenants there, and therefore if the Commissioners got possession of it and evaded regulation number one, they could not deal with it by giving it to tenants. There were no tenants' sons. The evicted tenants who were the third class could never get it as he would show in a moment when he came to deal with their case under the same circular, and as to the fourth class there were scores of these ranches where there were no such tenants in the immediate neighbourhood, and if the Commissioners succeeded in getting these tracts into their hands under these new regulations they could not use them for the purpose of improving or enlarging holdings.

He would now deal with Sub-section (a) of the third regulation, which was in the following terms—

> "The Estates Commissioners should only consider the question of providing a holding for a tenant evicted from any holding comprised in an estate upon the sale of that estate, and where there is untenanted land available for such purpose either comprised in an estate, or aquired by the Commissioners under Section 8 of the Act."

What did that mean? Before steps could be taken for the restoration of an evicted tenant the estate upon which the evicted holding was must be sold. That put an end to the possibility of the restoration of evicted tenants in Ireland. Take, again, the case of Lord Clanricarde. His hon. friend the Member for East Galway lived in a parish in which there were fifty evicted families living on the roadside, or upon the support given to them by their neighbours. They had been evicted for the last fifteen, eighteen, and some of them twenty years. They were on two estates, Lord Clanricarde's was one, and the other was the Lewis Estate. He thought there was no possibility, so long as these men were alive, of the estates being sold, and although the Commissioners thought they had power and were certainly exercising power of that kind, endeavouring to deal with the evicted tenants, they were now told that unless the estate was sold nothing could be done for those men. That was a most iniquitous regulation. It prevented the working of the evicted tenants' portion of the measure, and for his part he objected to any small amending Act being rushed through the House, without discussion, at the end of the session without the representatives of Ireland being given an opportunity of exposing the state of things.

He repeated, therefore, what he said the other day in answer to a reply given across the floor of the House by the right hon. Gentleman, that he would oppose, as far as he was concerned, by every means in his power every amending Act to facilitate sale in Ireland where the sale was of comparatively small importance so long as these iniquitous regulations were in force. The real truth of the matter was that so far as the essential portions of the Land Act were concerned they had broken down. He and his colleagues were of opinion that they would never work in the West of Ireland until the Congested Districts Board and the Estates Commissioners were invested with compulsory powers to deal with landlords of the type of Lord Clanricarde. There was a strong feeling in some parts of the country that compulsory powers ought to be conceded in regard to the congested portions in the West, and in regard to the problem of the great grazing ranches. He, for one, would not consent to any rushing through of the measure suggested by the right hon. Gentleman, and he hoped that when the right hon. Gentleman came to reply he would tell the House when he proposed to introduce the Bill, when he proposed to take the Second Reading, and what time would be offered for the examination and discussion of the measure.

*MR. MULDOON (Donegal, N.) said he rose for the purpose of seconding the Amendment that had been moved. He agreed with the assertion of his hon. and learned friend that in its main features and in its main purposes the Act of 1903 had been a failure, and if its operations proceeded at the same rate of progress as now he was afraid that the Irish land question ten years hence would be in a far worse condition than when the Land Act was first passed. He confessed that when the Chief Secretary rose he expected to hear from him some apology for the failure of the Act, which was confessed in the Report recently issued by the Estates Commissioners. He did not think that any Blue-book ever presented to this House within twenty-one months of the passing of an Act contained a more humiliating confession of the failure of British legislation for Ireland.

There were other causes besides want of money for the non-success of the Act. Not only had the Act been a failure, but every promise, every prospect held out by the Chief Secretary had failed. The responsibility for that failure, he admitted, was to be found in many causes; but chiefly, he thought, in the action of the Irish Executive themselves in reference to the Estates Commissioners. These Commissioners were gentlemen of great experience in regard to Irish land, and had been entrusted by the House with the exclusive administration of the Act. Notwithstanding that, the first act of the Executive was to issue regulations to them which were not made public, and which affected the main features and legal administration of the Act. Agents for the litigants appeared before the Commissioners to argue a point of law which had already been decided by instructions issued from Dublin Castle. Nevertheless, the farce had to be gone through.

The first of these cases was the important question under Section 5 of the security for the loan. That was argued before the Commissioners, although the decision had already come from Dublin Castle secretly. He said nothing about the Judicial Commissioner, because he believed that the Irish Executive had not treated him fairly in this matter, but he joined in the tribute which had been paid to the work he had gone through. When a point of this enormous importance in regard to the security, affecting public interests in Ireland to an enormous extent, came before the Judicial Commissioner the Irish Executive waited for a case in which the solicitor for the landlord and the solicitor for the tenant argued the same proposition of law. In the King-Harman Estate the contention put forward on behalf of the landlords was the same as that put forward by the tenant. The same happened with regard to the Blake Foster Estate. That estate came up for sale under Section 40 of the Land Act of 1896, and the price was agreed between the landlord and the tenant at fourteen years purchase. That amounted to £6,000. It did not go through because the Irish Land Commission reported that the security was bad and they refused to advance one penny. Under the Land Act of 1903, Section 1, the landlord and tenant made arrangements for nineteen years purchase and the amount involved was £8,900. The Land Commission, under the powers of Section 1, were asked to do nothing but approve of the advance, for no other reason in the world than that the tenants in that case were getting, by reason of the lower interest, a reduction of nearly forty per cent. The counsel for the tenants went before the Judicial Commissioner, who was to decide an important point of law which would effect an enormous number of tenants all over Ireland, asking him to approve of the price. The argument was that the Commission had no jurisdiction, except to express approval under the first Section of the Act. There was another case, in which the Treasury went before the Judicial Commissioner to argue that any money advanced for the improvement of land must come out of the reserve fund. There was no appearance for anybody except the Treasury. That case was argued for the Treasury by Mr. Matheson, and really it amounted to a farce. He had the report, which appeared in a legal paper, *The Jurist*, which stated that when Mr. Matheson had finished his argument for the Treasury, the judicial tribunal invited him to argue the case for the other side. Then Mr. Matheson proceeded with what he conceived might be argued by the other side, upon which the Judicial Commission said that he was bound to acknowledge that Mr. Matheson had not gone the length of imperilling to any great extent his own argument in behalf of the Treasury, but that he was sure that Mr. Matheson had done all he could. He put it to the House whether decisions on the interpretation of an Act of Parliament of enormous importance and involving great consequences should be taken under circumstances like that. It was not fair to the distinguished gentleman who filled the office of Judicial Commissioner. He put it to the Attorney-General whether it would not be possible to have matters of that kind—questions of abstract law—settled when both parties were represented. He could imagine nothing of more importance to the people of Ireland.

Almost every promise which had been made from the other side of the House when the Act of 1903 was passing through the House had either failed in operation or had been broken. The failure of the legislation of 1903 could only be measured by the speeches made by the right hon. Member for Dover when the Bill was being passed. On March 25th, 1903, the right hon. Member for Dover said that—

> "Some of the holdings ought not to be sold unless they were increased in size, and in the neighbourhood of estates where there was a congested population this ought to be dealt with."

Now, the instructions received by the Estates Commissioners from Dublin Castle showed, as had been pointed out by the hon. Member for Waterford, that that promise would not be carried out. It was the policy of Dublin Castle to prevent it being carried out. Again, on March 25th, 1903, the right hon. Member for Dover said—

> "The agrarian situation in Ireland is to be built up from the bottom. It is our object to enable every occupier to purchase an economic holding capable of maintaining himself and his family in decency and comfort."

The Estates Commissioners had adopted the system, outlined in their Report, of allowing the landlords to sell their estates block by block, and that rendered it impossible to carry out the promise of the right hon. Member for Dover. The landlord selected town lands where the tenants were under heavy arrears of rent; these town lands were sold and that set a precedent for all the other land. There was no question of congestion; no question of untenanted land; and no means of carrying out the policy outlined by the right hon. Member for Dover when the Act was passed through the House. There might be, in the immediate neighbourhood of that estate, a congested population, but it was not possible to deal with it. Nobody could pretend that there had been any effort to carry out the policy of the Act of 1903. Never had there been a bigger confession of failure than the present condition of things in the West of Ireland. It amounted to a confession on the part of the Executive that it was impossible to carry out their policy under the law as it now stood. The Estates Commissioners were given all the powers of the Congested Districts Board to sell to the tenants economic holdings, and to improve estates, yet no sooner were the Estates Commissioners installed in office than that particular section of the Act was repealed—practically repealed by His Majesty's Treasury.

With regard to the instructions lately issued by the Executive to the Commissioners, he could only say that, if he expressed exactly what he thought, he would be called to order, which was a thing he did not at present desire. The instructions said that in every case in which an application of any kind came before the Commissioner the first duty was to go into a roving commission to see if there had been any intimidation. This instruction simply repealed the whole of Section 1 of the

Act, because there there was only jurisdiction to approve if the price was within the limits mentioned. It was simply grotesque to suggest that these Commissioners were to go down and inquire in every case whether a threatening letter had been sent. As a result of all this the efforts to relieve the congestion of the West had dwindled down to the purchase of three estates only. A more complete failure could not be conceived, and the Committee would see that, having regard to the present condition of things, and to the acute situation which had arisen in the West of Ireland, it would be necessary for a new Bill to be brought in that the promises of the Act of 1903 might be fulfilled, a Bill which would not leave it in the power of the Castle or the Treasury to annul or destroy its provisions.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £83,315, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. John Redmond.*)

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said it had been stated that the Irish Land Purchase Act was an utter failure. It was a curious thing that failure of the Act in one direction was caused by its success in another. The failure of the Act, as far as he understood, was simply one of money, the great success of the Act was shown by the enormous number of applications, under it to sell estates and to purchase farms. The House must remember that this Act was brought in for the sake of the tenants. The tenants, as the House was aware, were the origin of the land question in Ireland, which had always been the great difficulty in the way of administration. In order to settle that question some way was required to settle the tenants, and the way the Act proposed was that the tenants should become the owners of the land they tilled. He had been accused by hon. Gentlemen opposite of opposing all Land Bills; but he absolutely denied that charge, for he had always supported them. He had always held that Irish tenants first of all required protection, and that the best solution of the question was to make the tenants the owners of their own land, and so he gave his cordial support to the Land Act. He did not think even Nationalist Members would maintain that a Minister would bring in a Bill involving £112,000,000 merely to back up landlords. The only reason the House passed the Act was because it was supposed to put an end to a hopeless political situation in Ireland. He was sure that if the Land Bill had been introduced to assist Irish landlords it would not have been received with much favour by any part of the House. That being so, he listened to the proposal of the Chief Secretary with great interest, because he looked upon that proposal as directly on the side of the tenants.

Admittedly there was a deadlock for want of money; how was that money to be provided? His right hon. friend had shown, at any rate, a possible solution. That solution had not met with the approval of Irish landlords. Those landlords contended that the Act promised payment in cash; this proposal proposed two-thirds payment in scrip, and the landlords refused that proposal. He personally was in favour of it. He looked upon it as probably the best offer the landlords would ever get and although undoubtedly at first sight it seemed unsatisfactory to take £92 instead of £100, yet he thought anyone who knew the history of finance would not fail to see that, in all probability, the land stock of the Government would soon be on the rising grade, and those landlords who did not like, and who refused to accept, the issue of stock at £92 would, if they accepted it, probably find that in a few years the stock would have gone up in the direction of par. Therefore, he did not think landlords, if they were wise, would reject this offer, because, undoubtedly, if his hon. friend's scheme were carried, it would to a great extent remove the block which now arrested the purchase of land in Ireland.

The hon. and learned Member for Waterford did not hold out much hope that the land question would be settled in the time of the present generation, because he said he intended to oppose any proposal made by any Government which did not deal with the graziers in the West of Ireland, which, of course, meant the same thing as turning out these graziers in order that their grass land might be cut up for the use of their neighbours. He (Colonel Saunderson) did not hear from the hon. and learned Gentleman what he was going to do with these unfortunate graziers after he had turned them out; he had certainly said nothing about compensating them. These poor graziers were apparently to be turned out of their farms on to the roads without any compensation whatever.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That is not an accurate description of my speech.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said it was as accurate as he could give it. At any rate, the hon. and learned Member intended to oppose any measure brought forward that did not at the same time include the taking up of grazing lands, and the reinstatement of evicted tenants. Therefore, the settlement of the land question would not depend upon how this Act succeeded, but whether a Bill was introduced at some future period dealing with these two questions. He did not think the present Government were likely to last long enough to bring in any such Bill, and he doubted whether hon. Gentlemen opposite who might form the next Administration would be very anxious to concede legislation of that kind. He thought the hon. and learned Member must have felt that his opposition to this Bill placed him in rather a difficult position, as he must know that a vast number of the Irish tenants were eager and anxious to become possessors of land, and landlords desired to sell, and that everything depended upon whether money was forthcoming or not. That was the question in Ireland. The hon. and learned Member got out of the difficulty by saying that his sympathies were so deeply engaged in the West, among the evicted tenants, that he opposed what would undoubtedly be a very popular measure among all classes until some legislation was brought forward dealing with these two questions.

The question was—had the Act been a failure in Ireland? They could not expect in two years to produce a great change, but proof that the Act was succeeding was shown by the immense number of application from both landlord and tenant. No doubt they all hoped that in the future the vast sums of money spent in Ireland would bring about a better state of things. He believed it would. When the tenants were in an independent position under this Act he thought they would probably look askance at a political agitation which up to the present meant cheap land for themselves. What did the House expect? They had been pelting sovereigns at the heads of the Irish tenants for twenty-five years, sowing money. Up to the present what had been the crop? The real crop was that which sat below the gangway. But in the future there was no doubt that the great object with which the Bill was passed two years ago would come to fruition, and Ireland would become a peaceful and prosperous part of the United Kingdom. He hoped this Bill would receive the sanction of the House. He feared there was not much chance, after the speech of the hon. and learned Member, of its passing at this late period of the session. If it did not, the fault would be, not with the Government, but on the shoulders of the hon. and learned Member and his friends who, for reasons of their own, opposed a measure which certainly would facilitate to a very considerable extent the progress of land purchase in Ireland.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) reminded the Committee that there was the question of land tenure, which was of some importance, to be considered. The last Report of the Land Commission was issued twelve months ago, and showed that there were 13,082 cases of appeal in fair-rent cases pending on April 1st, 1903. On April 1st, 1904, after the new scheme had come into operation, the number had increased to 13,808. They could, however, get no Report of the Land Commission save when it was fifteen months old. He wished, therefore, to know whether the Chief Secretary could give any information as to the progress made in the appeals in fair-rent cases during the past twelve months. He had recently listened to a debate in another place on this subject of the new Act and he felt that those who took part in it wanted cash for themselves and coercion for their tenants. That was the sum and substance of the debate.

As to the regulations dealing with intimidation he said there ought to be perfect freedom between the vendor and the purchaser. This House refused to grant compulsion upon the landlord—a compulsion they ought to have granted—but being refused there ought to be complete freedom between vendor and purchaser. The purchaser, if he were guilty of intimidation, or so-called intimidation, would be seriously punished under these regulations. He would be wholly deprived of the right of purchase, as the estate would go to the bottom of the list, and might be heard of twelve or fifteen years hence. But how was intimidation on the part of the landlord dealt with? It was not dealt with at all. He could quote communications from tenants in different parts of Ulster stating that they had been compelled to sign agreements giving what they considered to be absolutely unfair prices for the land. The compulsion upon them was that the landlord held the bog which was an absolute necessity of the farmer's life in Ireland, and unless the people paid the price demanded the bog was taken from them. There was no provision in the regulations for dealing with cases of that sort. Alleged intimidation on the part of the tenants was to be inquired into, but there was no proposal for inquiring into such duress on the part of the landlord, which was plentiful all over the province of Ulster. As to the facts, what means had the Estates Commissioners of finding out whether or not there had been intimidation? Were the Irish Office to define intimidation for their benefit? The Chief Secretary would surely not deny that controversy in a district over the price to be paid and the circumstances attending purchase was perfectly legitimate and even necessary. There was an actual case within his knowledge in which arrangements for purchase were going on, and agreements were being signed, when the board of guardians denounced the terms that were being arranged on the ground that they would prejudice the tenants on other estates in the neighbourhood. He was not sure that that was not perfectly legitimate, but what he wanted to know was whether, in such a case where the neighbourhood might be thrown into a state of excitement for which the tenants were not in any way to blame, would that be counted by the Estates Commissioners as intimidation? Were the tenants to be penalised because of the action of men in the neighbourhood who had no connection whatever with the property? That that was not at all an impossible event was shown by a recent case in Galway, where the tenants were anxious to buy. Lord Ashtown cruelly bought over their heads, and the Judge held that there had been an attempt to boycott graziers, although he had to admit that the tenants themselves were entirely innocent of it. Was the Chief Secretary going to give any guidance to the Commissioners as to what would constitute intimidation in these cases?

He held that the landlords in the West of Ireland were entirely to blame for the state of affairs that had arisen under the Act. They had been guilty of a gross breach of faith. These western tenants, many of whom were being prosecuted at Galway Assizes, were told that the Act of 1903 would add to their wretched uneconomic holdings grass lands to make them fit to live on. That was the avowed policy of the Land Act, which was passed as the result of an understanding between the representatives of the landlords and of the tenants. The basis of that understanding was of a two-fold character. The landlords agreed to sell their property on receiving a fair equivalent for their second-term rents. That was agreed upon at the Land Conference, and ratified by the Landlords' Convention, and it was the principle upon which the Bill became an Act of Parliament. The landlords also agreed to special terms being given to the West of Ireland and to the evicted tenants. Personally he was anxious to get rid of landlords anywhere. He did not take part in the Land Conference or the debate upon this question of the West of Ireland, because he was anxious to abolish landlordism everywhere. The agreement was that whilst it was a good thing to get rid of landlordism there were special circumstances connected with the West of Ireland that made the necessity for dealing with the problem there urgent.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover made promises with regard to the West of Ireland, and the Irish landlords got £12,000,000 as a bonus—which meant a gift—to induce them to accept the Land Act. What had happened? In the county of Galway there were great grass holdings and crowds of cotter tenants. When the Land Act was passed these cotters were told that they would get their holdings enlarged by the sale of these grass lands. The late Chief Secretary said that was his main purpose, and why should these poor suffering cotter tenants not think that the House would be as good as its word? It was absolutely wrong that these people should have sent threatening letters to graziers, but it should not be forgotten that these people had a right to expect that the landlords, having got £12,000,000 of public money in excess of the proper price of their land, would have stood to their part of the bargain. That policy had not been carried out, and the Chief Secretary had actually issued regulations that strangled and throttled the Act itself.

What were the landlords in the West of Ireland doing? Were they content with the equivalent for their second-term net income? Why, they were refusing to sell either to the Congested Districts Board or to the Estates Commission. Because if they did so they knew their land would be inspected by expert valuers, and they would get just the value of their land and no more. These landlords would not sell to the Land Commission, because they could make far better terms with the wretched tenants laden with arrears of rent and the bog they could take from them, and they could get any price they liked from these wretched people. Consequently they preferred direct sales and they were getting under the zones an equivalent to the prices paid for the best land in Antrim and Down. These landlords were now absolutely refusing to carry out their part of the bargain, and they were actually selling their wretched bogs and swamps—some of which were floating away—in the West of Ireland to the State at a fancy price. With regard to the grass lands, by which alone the policy of the Land Act could be carried out and the holdings made economic, the moment they were applied for by the tenants the landlords were up in arms and declined to sell. It was wrong for these tenants to send threatening letters, but it was much worse for the Government to make a set of regulations which practically repealed the Act in many important particulars.

With regard to the Land Judge's Court, what did the Chief Secretary mean by the first regulation? He did not blame the right hon. Gentleman so much, because it was impossible that the ablest Englishman could learn the lesson of Irish needs during three months experience of Ireland. He did, however, blame those who advised the right hon. Gentleman. Here they had applications of a direct character for £30,000,000, and the Estates Commissioners were instructed to time their applications to the Land Judge so as not to interfere with the priority of applications. If this was not really so serious it would be absolutely comic. The Estates Commissioners must buy when they got the chance in the Land Judge's Court. The Land Judge did not suit himself to their necessities. How could they time the application when the Land Judge sat every Thursday for the purpose of disposing of these estates. When they had not the money to come in and purchase them when they were exposed for sale, how were they ever to get them? Did the Chief Secretary know that the session before last the House passed a Resolution, with the consent of the Government, to wind up that Court? He did not know whether it was seriously passed or not. Probably the breakdown gang did not arrive in time. A division was imminent, and all the well-known Gentlemen who took part in such operations had said their say. At any rate, a Resolution was passed with the consent of the Chief Secretary. Now let him ask the Chief Secretary how could the Land Judge wind up his Court if he was fettered with a regulation like that, and if they prevented the Estates Commissioners from going into the Court and purchasing the estates that were for sale. They were going in the teeth of a Resolution of the

House by these regulations. They were wiping out every promise the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover made with regard to the poor tenants of the West of Ireland and with regard to the Land Judge's Court.

He agreed with the hon. and learned Member for Waterford that nothing could have been simpler, when they raised a loan of £5,000,000, to apply £3,000,000 or £3,500,000 to direct sales, to give Judge Ross £500,000 or £600,000, and devote the rest to the uneconomic holdings of the West of Ireland. There was some spite to the Member for Dover in it. He went too far to please the Irish landlords. His work must be undone, and his speeches rubbed off the slate, and the slate made clean. This was really what was being done, and nothing else.

MR. WALTER LONG: The hon. Member must not impute a motive of that kind. Whatever view we take of the administration of the Act, it is difficult enough without imputations of that kind.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said the right hon. Gentleman might say what he liked. He knew what was going on in Dublin. He knew that there was a conspiracy to undo the philanthropic part of the Act. Take the case of the evicted tenants, they had only to read the regulations to see that it would be impossible to carry out the intentions of the Act. The regulation hindered the evicted tenant from being reinstated until the estate was sold, and it effectually prevented his migration to other parts of the country.

There was another regulation to which no one had yet referred. He thought it the most interesting of all, and he should like to know its history. There were three Estates Commissioners. When a question of law was referred by the Estates Commissioners to the Judicial Commissioner in the event of any Estates Commissioner dissenting from the form of the reference agreed to by the majority, the dissenting Commissioner was to furnish the Judicial Commissioner with a note setting forth his reasons for dissenting. What did that mean? They might have called it the Wrench regulation. He had no feeling against Mr. Wrench. He was one of the few Members in the House who said a good word for Mr. Wrench when he was appointed under the Act of 1903. The hon. Member said he would be obliged to the Chief Secretary if he would produce anything like that in any Court in the world. The judgment of a Court was its judgment. Why should the judgment of the dissenting minority be sent up to the revising Court. The case ought to go to the Judicial Commissioner—let him decide it. Mr. Wrench was to be able to send up his opinion on a point of law to the Judicial Commissioner. What value was his opinion on a point of a law? It showed the spirit in which the whole code had been drawn.

He was not going to take any position on the financial proposal made by the Chief Secretary, save to say that he agreed with the hon. Member for Waterford in objecting to legislation regarding Irish affairs being brought in in the month of August, when nobody was in the House, and rushed through without discussion. He would be no party to that, no matter how small the Bill was. But was the case quite so bad as the Chief Secretary made out from the landlords' standpoint? What were the facts? When an estate was sold the landlord got 3½ per cent. or 3¾ per cent. or even 4 per cent., for the tendency was upwards now, on the purchase money until the vesting order was issued and the purchase was concluded. He ventured to say that 3½ or 4 per cent on the purchase money was pretty nearly equal, not to his rental, but to the rent which he actually received. Therefore why the hurry for the landlord? He could have understood the hurry for the tenants, but they had never been referred to that day. It was all in favour of the landlord. The tenant was delayed in getting the vesting order. Those years did not count as the years of purchase. He could see there was a great grievance of the tenants, but he did not see the grievance of the landlords. Did the right hon. Gentleman tell him that Members of the House of

Lords flocked there in order to remedy tenants' grievances?

Mr. WALTER LONG: In making my statement I endeavoured as clearly as I could to show that I did not refer to the tenants' aspect of the case, because the adoption of my suggestion would be to their benefit.

*Mr. T. W. RUSSELL said the landlords might accept or refuse the right hon. Gentleman's offer. The Bill embodying it might be opposed or passed without discussion. The grievance was largely a tenants' grievance, because the vesting order did not issue until the sale was complete. The Chief Secretary had been bound to admit that all the pressure he had received came from the landlords and not from the tenants on this matter. The Chief Secretary had got an immense number of applications, but neither the staff nor the buildings were adequate to deal with them. There was nothing worse in the public offices than the buildings in which these men carried out this great work which meant a revolution in land tenure in Ireland. Only £5,000,000 sterling of the £11,000,000 voted had been disbursed. Why was not the rest paid away? Simply because the clerical staff was insufficient for the work. There was no use getting more money if it was to be hung up as it now was. The first necessity was to get a capable and competent staff to carry out the work.

He had not the slightest hesitation in telling the Chief Secretary that in the twenty years he had had to do with political work and land agitation in Ireland, nothing more—he was going to say infamous—but nothing worse than these regulations had issued from Dublin Castle. They had been drawn up by men whom the Chief Secretary did not know now but would know by-and-by, by men who never approved of the Land Act and never believed in the late Chief Secretary. They were drawn for the purpose, not of forbidding direct sales, where the Irish landlord would get cash down, but of preventing the philanthropic work in the West of Ireland over which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover almost shed tears in that House. The Chief Secretary and those members of the Government who probably desired to see this work carried through were in the hands of far more crafty and worse men than themselves, men who wished to stop all reform, to prevent people getting the chance and of a decent living. The tenants were all in a hurry to buy. He told them there that night that there was no hurry. There was no freehold of the Treasury Bench; there was no freehold of Dublin Castle, and he could conceive no Government worthy of the name succeeding the present Government who would not wipe these regulations out from first to last.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he associated himself with the protest which the hon. Member for Waterford had made. He was not acquainted with the details, and therefore he would not discuss the matter further. He took great interest in the suggestion which the Chief Secretary had made with regard to the expediting of purchase which was going on in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman had been accused of making the suggestion solely in the interest of the landlords. The Chief Secretary had indicated that if something was not done there would be a tendency for the legislation of 1903 to come to a standstill altogether owing to the block in Dublin, and he had indicated to the House that, in the interest of all concerned in Ireland, it would be a good thing if the proceedings could be expedited. He, himself, had ventured to suggest months ago that perhaps something could be done to facilitate matters in Ireland on the lines of the London Water Bill. Although the scheme now submitted to the House by the right hon. Gentleman differed from that adopted by him in buying out the London water companies, it was one to which it was well worth while to give a little attention, because something would have to be done soon if the position in Ireland was not to become perfectly farcical. There was no reason why a bargain to purchase should be prolonged for twenty years. A transaction to buy an estate should be completed as soon as practicable, and therefore provision must be made to complete the transaction in two, three, or four years, instead of a period akin to a quarter of a century. The Committee, therefore, should look at the suggestions of the Chief Secretary from that point of view.

In making the contrast between the purchase of the water companies and the present scheme, he showed that both proposals entitled the vendors to obtain cash if they wished. There was the difficulty, however, to raise the loan out of which the vendors of the water companies had to be paid, and the idea of the right hon. Gentleman was to offer these vendors stock at the price at which it could be sold on the market. Water stock, therefore, instead of being a drug in the market, went up in price, and it could be sold advantageously within a few weeks or months when cash was needed. The money market was satisfied with it, and the whole thing went off exceedingly well. The cost of the investment was saved by that transaction, and a very wise and most successful financial operation was carried through. The right hon. Gentleman now made a very small suggestion to the Irish landlords to facilitate the work over there; but that suggestion was entirely different from what was offered to the vendors of the water companies stock in London. The right hon. Gentleman offered the stock at par; but if stock were offered at par, which was only worth 92 in the open market at the present moment, not much facilitation would be given to land purchase.

Now, it was not in anybody's interest that land purchase in Ireland should be hung up. The settlement of the land question in the West of Ireland could only be achieved by making the purchases more rapidly. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether there was any necessity to put in any amending Bill a provision in regard to the price at which the stock was to be offered to the landlord. Probably the right hon. Gentleman had been led to offer the stock at par because of the necessity to see how much stock the landlords would have to get so as to have a fixed and definite price. That might be all very well if the price of the stock was at 96 or 97; but seeing that it was only at 92, with no reasonable certainty that it would get higher soon, he thought the difference was too big to make the scheme successful. The right hon. Gentleman might agree to declare, from time to time, a price between the two figures. That might go some way to meet the difficulty. If the right hon. Gentleman, under Treasury Order, took power to declare the price at which the stock would be issued, that might help the landlords over the gap, and prove a great facility in making land sales.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said he did not know that he quite understood the somewhat tedious argument of the hon. Gentleman who last spoke. It seemed to him that it amounted to the landlord taking a franc for a shilling. He hoped that the attitude of the Irish Members would not be misunderstood; and, to borrow the phrase of the hon. Member for South Tyrone, he trusted that the philanthropic portion of this Act would not be lost sight of. They viewed with something more than alarm—with heartbreaking anxiety—the fact which stood out with deplorable plainness, that while large transactions were taking place between landlord and tenant where the question was less acute, the Act of 1903 was practically a failure in the congested districts and those parts associated with the evicted tenants. Surely that was a most serious matter. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh seemed to think that the Nationalist Members looked upon the Act with hostility. That was not the case; but the right hon. and gallant Gentleman forgot that some of the most important questions connected with the Act of 1903 related to the congested districts and to the evicted tenants. These were the most important questions in Ireland at the present moment. The Chief Secretary and the Attorney-General for Ireland could not controvert the fact that there would have been no possibility of the Act of 1903 passing through Parliament—certainly not with the approval of the Irish representatives—had it not been for the provisions in the Bill relating to the congested districts and the evicted tenants.

He thought that at this time of day it was most unjust to misconstrue the action of the Irish Members of all classes in regard to the Act of 1903. There was a unanimous desire, on both sides of the House, to work out a solution of the land question. There was no *arrière pensée* in regard to that. But, after nearly two years administration of the Act, when they found that the most pressing grievances in relation to the whole land question, especially in the West of Ireland, were being put aside, and that the Act was not operative, they were justified in expressing their opinion thereon. The Irish Party would be no consenting party to an amending Act which touched only one portion of the problem, and left the larger problem outside. He would be very glad to see some scheme of financial reform by which the transactions of land sale and purchase could be facilitated, but not at the cost of the evicted tenants or any other section of the Irish population for whom they had pleaded year after year and for whom the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover had pleaded with feeling and power in that House. It seemed as if the present Chief Secretary and his advisers were anxious to wipe the speeches and promises of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover off the slate. It looked uncommonly as if that was the wish of the officials in Dublin Castle.

It had been said more than once that more depended for good government on administration than on legislation; and that was true in regard to the Act of 1903. They on the Irish Benches were anxious to know what was the explanation of the policy of concealment in regard to the rules and regulations issued by the Irish Executive to the Estate Commissioners and to which the Estates Commissioners referred in their Report. He understood that all instructions of that kind, dealing with principles and vital details, would be communicated to this House. Why were the regulations of 1904 concealed, and why had the Irish Members had no opportunity of seeing them? He was firmly persuaded that these regulations of 1904 were issued at the psychological moment. The great argument in favour of the zone system was that it dispensed with the inspection which was at once a protection for the tenant and also to the ratepayers. But with regard to the non-judicial holdings that was not so. A fair rent had not been fixed, and accordingly inspectors were required to inquire into the security for the holding and as to the equity of the price to all parties concerned. The interim Report showed quite clearly that some subtle mind had been at work in Dublin Castle to prevent the Act being carried out as it was intended. Whoever had taken that responsibility, there could be no doubt there was a wide difference between the instructions given to the Commissioners and the directions given in the Act. Directions were given to the Estates Commissioners as to how this Act was to be worked, and, those directions coming from the Executive Government, the Executive Government and the Chief Secretary were responsible.

One very important fact in regard to the instructions recently issued was that by those instructions the Estates Commissioners felt themselves coerced into accepting whatever price the Land Judge's Court fixed under the 40th Section. The Estates Commissioners should not be coerced in that way. If in the exercise of their discretion they said the tenant should not give more than a certain price for the land there was delay, and through the Land Judge's Court pressure was put upon them to give more than the value of the land. The paragraph in the instructions with regard to intimidation was the most curious paragraph that could ever have appeared in a State document. How were the inspectors to judge what was intimidation? Everyone knew how easy it was to bring a charge of intimidation against anyone, and how hard it was to rebut. Who was to define what was intimidation and what was not? The smallest boy in a school could draw a skull and crossbones, and half print in ink words of a threatening character. Would such a thing as that be interpreted as intimidation? In a case where there had been intimidation, the estate, when it came into the hands of the Estates Commissioners, was to be put at the bottom of the list of those estates which were to be dealt with. Anything more cruel could not be conceived. Let them suppose a case of an estate on which one tenant was so disgusted that he wrote an intimidating letter to his landlord. Were all the other tenants on that estate, because of the act of this one man, to be denied their rights for four or five years for the reason that the estate had been intimidated?

He would also like to know the meaning of Sub-section (a) Regulation 3, with regard to the evicted tenants. He had always been led to understand that the most criminal of all the classes of tenantry were those who entered into a combination to intimidate, but he found now that if only one person intimidated an estate all the rest of the tenants were to suffer with him. From the regulations it appeared that those who had taken part in a general rent dispute might be considered, while evicted tenants who through the caprice of rack-renting landlords had been driven out were not to be considered at all. What justification was there for the issue of these regulations to the Estates Commissioners to restrain and confine their action; and how was it there was no opportunity for discussing the former instructions of February, 1904? There seemed to be some sinister underhand operations at work. The Act was passed two years ago with the blessings of all Parties. All classes in Ireland welcomed the Act in the hope that it would settle the land question. That hope had been cruelly blasted; the promises made by the Government had not been kept, for as soon as a body of men had been appointed to carry out the Act fairly and equitably they were hampered in this way, and the old sinister influences of Dublin Castle prevailed.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.) said it appeared to be useless to argue under present conditions. Enough arguments had been brought forward to convince any man who had any desire or inclination to be convinced, and no defence whatever of the present state of affairs had been attempted except by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh. The administration of the Land Act was directed wholly for the benefit of the landlords, while the interests of the tenants and the future of the Irish nation were left entirely out of consideration. The Chief Secretary confessedly knew nothing whatever about the country, and it was extremely difficult to get from him a straight Answer to any straight Question in connection with the administration of the Land Act. The right hon. Gentleman depended for his technical and local knowledge upon the Attorney-General, and he could not depend upon a more objectionable and unreliable source, as the right hon. and learned Gentleman never hesitated to take his stand by the side of the minority and the landlords, as against every other interest. The only consolation was that the time was coming when the Attorney-General and his friends and relatives would no longer be the rulers of the country, or the makers of new regulations under the Land Act.

During the passage of the Land Bill in 1903 he was explicitly informed that the Estates Commissioners would have power to deal with a farm from which a tenant had been evicted as a separate estate. In county Kerry, although there had been rent disputes on a large scale, and the relations between landlord and tenant had been extremely strained, yet the plan of campaign was not adopted, except, perhaps, in one case. Nevertheless, there were in the county no less than 411 evicted tenants, and nothing whatever had been done for them by the Estates Commsssioners with a view to reinstating them in their former holdings. He instanced two cases in which the landlords had shown their willingness to do their part, but, in spite of repeated applications, no assistance whatever could be obtained from the Estates Commissioners, although a little assistance now would mean all the difference between prosperity and ruin to the men. He had no objection to evicted tenants in other parts of Ireland being well treated; Irish Members had no limit to their constituencies in this matter; but he did complain when there were so many as 411 in one county that nothing whatever should have been done, in spite of all the hopes that were held out in connection with the Land Act. He strongly held that the Estates Commissioners had been dilatory in the performance of their duty. Another matter of which he complained was that instructions should have been issued under which, to give a particular instance, the Commissioners were compelled to pay £571 for an estate which they themselves said was worth only £400. That such a condition of things should prevail was a disgrace. The question deeply concerned the future of the Irish people, because any losses that might arise from the maladministration of the Land Act would have to be paid for out of Irish resources and would be a burden on the Irish nation in the future.

He submitted it was time the Chief Secretary discarded the advice, instructions, and prejudices of Gentlemen like the Attorney-General, and tried to get to the bottom of the Irish question. These instructions ought to be withdrawn and the Estates Commissioners given an opportunity of dealing in a judicial and impartial manner between the different classes in Ireland. It was necessary to protest very vigorously and constantly in that House because they could not expect English Members to listen to their arguments, for they believed their grievances were of a local character. The only remedy was to leave the Irish people to settle their own business according to their own methods. They could not expect the Chief Secretary, belonging as he did to a Party hostile to the Irish people, and allied with the Irish landlords, to grasp all the facts of the Irish claim. The Chief Secretary had told them that his Bill was based upon information from Irish officials, who were generally either Englishmen or anti-Irishmen, who could only obtain their official positions by betraying their country. He had concluded that it was impossible to convince this House by argument, and Ireland's only opportunity would come out of England's difficulty. Probably that opportunity would soon arrive in the case of the present Government. The Land Act was not in itself bad, but, like many other Acts, it was the administration of it that made it a curse, and in the county of Kerry, at any rate as far as the evicted tenants were concerned, the administration of the Land Act had been more of a curse than a blessing.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.) said he wished to explain his own position in regard to this measure. He did not agree with the Landlords' Convention with whom he usually acted upon this matter, and although he preferred the scheme suggested by the hon. Member for Islington, he presumed that scheme was impossible for some reason unknown to him. With regard to the scheme put forward by the Chief Secretary, being perfectly voluntary it was one which would tend to reduce the difficulty of the land problem, and although a considerable number of landlords would not for various reasons accept those terms and take two-thirds in stock, there would be a considerable body who would. Some would prefer those payments in order to have their claims settled. He thought that the sum which would be cleared off immediately by that means would be £30,000,000. They had already cleared off, or would shortly clear off, £15,000,000, so that £45,000,000 out of the £100,000,000 would be accounted for. Unquestionably in that case it could not be said that the Act had not worked. There was no doubt that the Act had been a remarkable success in regard to the number of persons who had come in to buy. At the present time they did not want to flood the market by issuing any more stock than would be required. His right hon. friend appeared to think that the Leader of the Irish Party had avowed his hostility to this scheme, but he understood the hon. and learned Member to say that all he desired was an opportunity for a full discussion, and he did not think that he went as far as hostility to this proposal. He wished to express his own approval of the scheme which the right hon. Gentleman had brought forward.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) said he did not intend to discuss the Chief Secretary's proposal now. He agreed with the hon. and learned Member for Waterford that this proposition should have been introduced earlier in the session. The Act of 1903 had been an absolute failure because the price charged under that Act had far exceeded, in almost every case by 33 per cent., and in some cases by 50 per cent., the price charged under the Ashbourne Acts. In his own county the Act had brought no appreciable relief, because, inevitably, the landlord would screw the difference out of the tenant. The tenant would be called upon under this scheme to pay the difference between £92 and £100, and not the landlord at all. At the present time there was general dissatisfaction existing amongst the tenants, and more especially amongst the evicted tenants. In Longford something like eighty-six claims had been lodged and sixteen properties had been sold. To prove the absolute failure of this Act as far as the evicted tenants were concerned, he only needed to mention that in regard to the properties he had mentioned only three out of eighty-six were connected with evicted tenants. He had repeatedly asked if nothing could be done to restore these evicted tenants or find equivalent holdings for them elsewhere. There were a number of patches of untenanted grazing land which by the consent of all parties could be acquired for the purpose of providing equivalent holdings for the evicted tenants if a little trouble were taken. If the land was placed in the hands of the Commissioners they would probably then take some steps to acquire it, but they would not go out of their way or take the smallest trouble to search out some equivalent holdings which could easily be pointed out, and which could be acquired at a fair price if proper instructions were given.

Was there any serious intention of giving effect to the promises and pledges of the late Chief Secretary for Ireland as regarded these evicted tenants? So long as they left this question unsettled, and allowed the tenants to see side by side with their miserable hovels and cabins large areas of green grazing land in the occupation of graziers who had no legal title, how could they have peace in Ireland, or how could they expect the land question to be settled between landlord and tenant? So long as the Chief Secretary only took care of the big landlords, and neglected the interests of the poor and suffering, so long would there be discontent. There was a gentleman, one of the Judicial Commissioners for hearing appeals, who knew as much about the value of land as he himself knew of what was going on in the moon. He took his cue from the assessor who sat with him. The assessor was a land agent whose interest was not to give the tenants lower rents. He knew of a recent case in which there was an appeal both by the landlord and the tenant and where the assessor actually doubled the rent which was fixed by the Sub-Commissioner in the county of Longford. What training had this gentleman for the position which he occupied and which enabled him when dealing with an appeal to make such a differentiation of rent from that fixed by the Sub-Commissioner.

An extraordinary thing about the appeal department of the Land Commission was the delay which took place. It took three years, sometimes five years, to get an appeal through, although there were two legal gentlemen connected with the department. He hoped that some attention would be given by the right hon. Gentleman to the question of the sittings of the Appeal Commission. It was an intolerable thing that tenants had to continue paying the old rents for two or three years while waiting the pleasure of Justice Meredith or Justice Fitzgerald to go down to the county town to hear a batch of appeals. These Judges took three or four months holiday during the long vacation. It would tend a great deal more to the success of the working of the Act if they gave at least half of that time to the disposal of appeals. He entirely associated himself with everything that had been said by the Leader of the Irish Party and the other Nationalist Members who had spoken. They had put before the right hon. Gentleman what was the true solution of the land question. They could tell him that so long as he took advice from hon. Members on the opposite side of the House rather than from the Irish representatives on this side, there was no hope of his settling the land question.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) said he knew of cases in county Kerry where there were evicted tenants who should have been reinstated, but, as the estate from which they had been evicted had not been offered for sale, this had not been practicable. Small properties might have been acquired, however, on which the Estates Commissioners could have given them holdings, and he thought if the powers of the Commissioners could be broadened a little to enable them to acquire land a short distance away from the estate where the evictions took place, a great deal of the difficulty as regarded evicted tenants could be got over. Much had been said since the Land Act had been in operation as to the desire of the landlords to meet the tenants fairly in any negotiations which took place. He would give the House an example of what occurred in a well-known part of Kerry as illustrating the ridiculous demands made by agents of the landlords. In Greenbeigh the agent acting on behalf of the landlord, in his presence, had the audacity to ask for twenty-four years purchase for the holdings of the tenants. But in the course of six or seven weeks he was prepared to negotiate on the basis of twenty years purchase and he was hopeful, now that the tenants were an organised body treating directly, that in a very short time they would be able to purchase their holdings on reasonable terms. It was said that the tenants went in for intimidation, but he contended that a landlord and agent who could come down in their price to the extent of four years purchase in five or six weeks should be taken at their own valuation.

The Land Act had also worked unfairly in another part of his constituency. He referred to the Warden Estate, near Sneem, which had been a by-word throughout the whole of Ireland. There were about twenty-six evicted tenants on that estate, and it was arranged that they should be restored to their holdings, but so far as he knew in not a single case had this been done. He had been informed that one of the reasons why the Warden Estate had not passed into the possession of the tenants was that there was not a sufficient staff to carry out the proposed improvements. He thought in a district like South Kerry, where there were no large grazing tracts, where very often the estates had to be settled as they were, and where the sale had to be carried through without the possibility of actually enlarging the holdings, there was no reason why there should be such an extraordinary delay as had taken place on the Warden Estate. He hoped the Chief Secretary would see that the Estates Commissioners sent down men to carry out the necessary improvements on that estate so that the evicted tenants might be restored to their holdings.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.) expressed the hope that when the right hon. Gentleman came to explain what inspired him to issue the instructions he would deal with the question of intimidation. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would tell the House why, in dealing with intimidation, he had confined himself absolutely to the cases of tenants and taken no steps to deal with cases of intimidation on the part of landlords. He had seen in the north of the county of Mayo, perhaps one of the most impoverished parts of Ireland, the cruelties which resulted from the exacting system of ruthless landlords, who demanded the exorbitant price of twenty-two years purchase for bog land. When the tenants refused to satisfy such an exorbitant demand, notices of ejectment were served, in some cases merely for the hanging gale—simply because there were six or twelve months rent due. He asked the Attorney-General why there was one law for the landlords and another for the tenants. They had been told by the Chief Secretary that public meetings of tenants called for the purpose of riveting attention on the evils under which the tenants suffered amounted to intimidation.

He was interested and amazed at the speech delivered by the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, who stated that the Land Act of 1903 was an Act purely in the interest of the tenants. He did not know whether the right hon. and gallant Member had ever heard of the proposed sale of the Moore Estate in Antrim. It was offered five years ago for twenty years purchase. The tenants refused to buy the land because it was too dear. The spokesman of the tenants was a Protestant minister. Since the Land Act was passed the hon. and learned Member who owned the estate had asked twenty-eight years purchase and had got it. Of course, all this splendid arrangement was in the interest of the tenants, and not of the landlord. When, in the face of such a transaction as that, the right hon. and gallant Member said that the Land Act of

1903 was in the interest of the tenants, he only showed how little he thought of the intelligence of the British Members. The Land Act of 1903 would never have been accepted by the Irish Members and the people of Ireland as a solution of the difficulty unless it had dealt with two vital matters, namely, the restoration of the evicted tenants and the question of the congested districts in the West of Ireland. The Act had been a perfect farce so far as these two things were concerned. The Act had been used by the landlords of Ireland for the purpose of extracting exorbitant terms out of the tenants. The tenants' representatives in that House accepted the scheme by which the landlords got a bonus of £12,000,000, not because they believed the landlords were entitled to it, but because they believed that no sacrifice could be too great to stay the opposition of a class who had ground down the best peasantry in the world, and made it impossible for them to eke out an existence in their mountain homes. The habitations of the people in some parts of Ireland were not fit for dogs.

The strong Chief Secretary who was to make law and order respected in Ireland had told them that day that intimidation was on the increase. If, so, why was it? The people of Ireland relied upon the promises of the Government. They depended on the so-called spirit of conciliation, and because once again Ireland had listened to the promises of British statesmen, which had not been kept, Ireland had had to return to the trade-union methods carried on in England. They had been forced to realise that it was only by the strength of a banded people against the strength of a band of robbers that they could obtain anything like their rights. The right hon. Gentleman had been long enough in Parliament to know that every measure of land reform or material progress which had been passed for Ireland had been extracted almost at the point of the bayonet by a courageous people fighting for the right to live on their native soil. This Bill was passed two years ago, and the British Parliament gave the Irish landlords a bonus of £12,000,000 to sell their lands to the tenants. They were also to get three years more purchase than under the Ashbourne Act, and yet they were not satisfied. The Nationalist Members were contending for the rights and the livelihood of the agricultural population of the country. They saw 30,000 of the best brawn and brain leaving Ireland every year and going across to America. They saw these men and their children growing up with a hatred of England. Look at the great grazing lands in the West where the growth in the number of cattle went side by side with a decrease in the population by emigration, while those that were left were in the most deplorable condition. It was all very well for the Chief Secretary, with skilful dialectic, to talk of the increase of intimidation. There would be intimidation if there was not justice. The powers of organisation of the people would be brought into play; and if the right hon. Gentlemen the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General could find no better method of dealing with Ireland than by issuing instructions to block the Town Tenants' Bill, they might find something more to do in the coming winter in dealing with an incensed people.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent) said that all would remember the promises held out to the House on the passage of the Land Act in 1903. Universal peace was to descend upon the whole of Ireland. He ventured to say at the time that he did not think the truce would last long. He had not had to wait long for the fulfilment of that prediction. He reminded hon. Members of what had been done by the Government as far as the British taxpayer was concerned. They had given the Irish nation a gift of £12,000,000. What had been given in return? Absolutely nothing. The only thing they had got was a shilling income-tax last year, a shilling income-tax this year, and the prospect of a shilling income-tax for some time to come. This was greatly owing to the Land Act so recklessly passed two years ago. He thought they had a right to be disappointed with the result. He did not know what the present Chief Secretary was going to do, but he hoped that any concessions he might make would not take the form of allowing any more public money to be used for the purposes of this Act. His own view was, and always had been, that no matter how much money they might give for the purpose of land purchase in Ireland, that money would be absolutely and entirely wasted. They might go on throwing money into the sea; Parliament might pass Land Act after Land Act, but no final and complete solution of the Irish land question would ever be arrived at. He did not think they had had satisfactory results from the Act so far, and if ever he had wanted any justification for the course taken in opposing the Second Reading he found it in the frequent debates in that House with regard to the working of the Act.

SIR ERNEST FLOWER (Bradford, W.) said that the hon. Member for Stoke alleged that the Land Act had been a failure. How could anyone call an Act a failure which had resulted in so many agreements having been concluded between landlord and tenant—a number which had absolutely surpassed the expectation of its promoters? He admitted, and he thought anyone who knew Ireland would admit, that the final settlement of the Irish land question must be a long process. They could not hope to do it in two years time; but surely up to the present a great deal had been achieved in this direction. Irish Members who indulged in flights of rhetoric and eloquence were carried away further than they perhaps expected. Evictions were not so cruel as they had been in the past. The general condition of Ireland was extremely good, and there was a general readiness on the part of landlords and tenants to come together under the terms provided by the Land Act. So long, however, as the block in the Land Court prevailed, the continued smooth working of the Act was out of the question. Landlords and tenants could not come to a purchase agreement with the prospect of a long series of years before the tenant could enter into possession and the landlord get his money. It was absolutely necessary, therefore, that some machinery should be devised to accelerate purchase and to facilitate the working of the Act.

He himself thought that the plan of the Chief Secretary was the very best that in the circumstances could be suggested. He was a landlord who had come to an agreement with his tenants which had met with approbation on both sides; but why should he wait indefinitely for his money? The right hon. Gentleman had said that an increase of the floating debt could not be contemplated, and that in the present state of the finances not more than £5,000,000 could be got each year for purchase. The right hon. Gentleman then came along with an offer of stock, and the landlord, instead of getting £100 in money, would only get stock worth £92, which was a loss of 8 per cent. To a great many landlords whose margin between solvency and insolvency was very slight, there might be some difficulty about that. It was only fair to say that though the convention of Irish landlords was antagonistic to the proposal of the Chief Secretary, he believed, none the less, that the scheme would find a large measure of acceptance among Irish landlords generally. The experiment, at all events, was worth a trial; and he hoped that the hon. Member for Stoke would not so coldly despair of the Irish land question being solved in the future. He himself believed that it was in the course of being solved, although slowly.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.) said in contributing his quota to the debate before the House he did not intend to trouble the House with a speech of long duration. However, so many and such varying and conflicting interests came within the scope of the Amendment that, although disposed to be brief, he might yet have to speak at some length. From time to time within the past few months the Irish Members had pressed for some explanation from the Government on the nature of the instructions given by them to the Estates Commissioners for the discharge of their public duties in connection with the Land Purchase Act of 1903. Those instructions were at one time said to be confidential, at another time of a verbal character, but, finally, under the authority of His Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant, they had been published, but did not appeal to them as likely to inspire much confidence in their spirit of fair play or impartiality. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford, with his usual acumen and ability, had analysed and dissected them.

The Act of 1903 was hailed all around as a great legislative enactment and one calculated in Ireland as likely to heal up old sores and if properly and fairly worked by its administrators to go very far in settling the great land problem. The Irish Members, over-confident in the good faith of the landlord party, boomed it much beyond its worth. He confessed that, although a humble Member of the rank and file of the Irish Party, his views in regard to it were by no means optimistic. He always bore in mind that classical saying, *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, and he held that subsequent events bore out his forebodings. Surely, on the face of it, it looked a big thing for the Government to be prepared to advance £112,000,000 of money wherewith to pay off landlords for their land and to give the Irish tenants sixty-eight and a-half years for the repayment of the money to the Treasury. But that was the best feature of the Act. Everything solid, substantial, and unchangeable was on the side of the landlord; the conditions under which the tenant could obtain fulfilment of his side of the bargain were fluctuating, undecided, hardshipping, and oppressive. The £5,000,000 per year were mainly devoted to the direct sales as between landlord and tenant on the good lands on which tenants were mainly solvent, and scarcely a tithe of the annual sum advanced was available for the most pressing needs of the situation; that was the acquisition through the Estates Commissioners of money wherewith to purchase the untenanted ranches in Connaught and elsewhere whereon to plant the soldiers of the land war, the evicted tenants, the struggling labourers, and the poor occupiers of uneconomic holdings.

According to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary about £28,000,000 worth of land had been arranged for since the passing of the Act to be transferred from landlord to tenant. The amount necessary to cope with that state of things was not forthcoming from the Treasury nor scarcely one-third of it, but the right hon. Gentleman said he was prepared to meet the crisis by a short Bill paying off vendors in scrip presumably 8 per cent. below par, but if he knew landlords rightly, they would make sure of bringing the value of their sales to par by putting on the screw through the arrears due, and the mad craze for purchase which had seized the tenants, particularly in Leinster and the North of Ireland, where there was no public opinion to guide them. In the Land Act of 1903 the landlord had all the advantages, the tenant scarcely any. Under the Ashbourne Act and the Act of 1891 the average prices were seventeen and a-half or eighteen years purchase, but now, favoured as he was by the zone system, and secured from diminution of price by the doing away of the inspection of holdings, the landlord could exact a price fully 30 per cent. over the Ashbourne standard with that nice penny called the bonus thrown in for a *solatium*. Where was the benefit to the tenant of the purchase money being advanced at 3¼ instead of 4 per cent. interest when it all turned over into the pocket of the landlord, and where were those decadal reductions foreshadowed in that precious document the Conference Report? He would set down the Irish landlords into three classes, the big important men who loved to be landlords and to have serfs under them for all time; the middle-class landlords, many of whom were desirous of selling for purposes best known to themselves; and those of them whose estates were mortgaged up to the hilt; the last-mentioned class did not by any means want to sell provided they could get from the mortgagees and receivers as much as would keep body and soul together and a decent rag of clothing, they prefered being reckoned poor landlords rather than poor beggars or inmates of a workhouse.

With regard to "conciliation." There was no such a thing in reality as a "conciliation policy;" it was pure humbug, pure moonshine, and, on the landlord side, pure deceit. The Irish peasant farmer or labourer was naturally conciliatory; his religious teaching, his code of ethics, applied as best he could by his own lights, even the humility begotten of his position, all tended to make him conciliatory even to those who ill deserved his kind act, but the recommendations of the practice of such a virtue towards the landlord who, vampire-like, was sucking away the blood of his victim was simply cruel. He could compare such conduct as between landlord and tenant only to the work of a cow let loose from her stake and goring the other cow still bound almost to death. Some of those landlords, wiser in their generation than the big crowd, entered into a conference with representative men of the Irish race. The result of their deliberations helped a good deal to formulate the Act of 1903, but that Act was far behind the recommendations of the conference. The landlords took, apparently with a good grace, what suited them in the Report and made up their minds to fight on for the remainder of their almost impossible demands.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SHEFFIELD UNIVERSITY BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

SUPPLY [15TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1905-6.

CLASS III.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £83,415, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

MR. LUNDON, continuing, said particular stress was laid on the importance of reinstating the evicted tenants, but when the sales of the estates came around the very landlords who were signatories to the compact tore the document into tatters, and even one of them, that noble Earl who wished to give them that nondescript thing called "Devolution" in order to sap the foundation of their nationality, would not reinstate his evicted tenant John Ryan. This poor victim of landlord rapacity had been a long time on the roadside. He lived within two miles of Adare Mansion, the seat of the Earl of Dunraven, and just outside the demesne wall of Mr. Peter Fitzgerald. It was over a year since poor John Ryan came to a meeting they were holding in Limerick, and told them in his own plain way that Dunraven was selling and that he was now getting back, but on last Saturday three weeks he met Mrs. Ryan and she told him they were now as far as ever from reinstatement. That was a sample of the "conciliation policy."

Some of the English Members in this House were at a loss to know how the working of this Act had been an absolute failure considering the "*entente cordiale*" to speak in diplomatic terms, which seemed to exist when the Bill on which the Act was based was going through the House. For their information, he would tell the Committee. There were two parties, landlords and tenants, mainly concerned in this Act; a third party, and a powerful party by reason of their money, lay behind these, that was a party of mortgagees and gombeen money-lenders who, because they had money to advance to the needy landowners, obtained from them on their appointment as agents *carte blanche* to act as they pleased. Most of those mortgagees were obtaining 6 per cent. interest on their money and 5 per cent. for the collection of rents, that was 11 per cent. in all, and, with such a return from their money, he would indeed be a simple man who could expect that those characters would be in a hurry with the sales of the estates. Those gombeen agents when approached for sale generally put on a fancy figure which in most cases acted as a repellant; but where negotiations were protracted and under the pressure of arrears they succeeded in obtaining their pound of flesh, a temporary arrangement was arrived at, but only in a few days to be rearranged by the man of usury with another year for arrears to be added on the credit side of his ledger. The percentage on the difference as between the former rent and the future instalments under the purchase had the changes rung on it, and the "concilation policy" once again was given to the breeze with a vengeance.

As so many able Members from their benches were prepared to speak on this Amendment he would endeavour to be brief and practical. One of the hon. Members on the opposite side of the House said the Purchase Act was a great success and no doubt he spoke in all sincerity, he also said that when the Bill was before the House he voted against it on Second Reading although a staunch supporter of the Government. This led him to believe that he estimated the success from a landlord's standpoint; so far he was telling the truth. Another hon. Gentleman from the same side, who spoke after him, considered the advantages of the same Act were of a rather doubtful nature, but he had been selling his estates and perhaps not getting as much for them as he considered they were worth and it might be that the price was not forthcoming as quickly as required. It was sometimes rather annoying to be waiting for money if one was much in need of it, but, if the Members from Ireland were able, some of those landlords would have a long wait for a "Landlord Relief Bill" unless there could be attached a clause dealing with the compulsory reinstatement of the evicted tenants. How those poor victims of landlord oppression and rapacity had been dealt with was simply scandalous, and all this was done to keep them in the position of scarecrows to deter others from allowing themselves to get into arrears, and to make them pay up the arrears though they had to beg, borrow, or steal the rent.

They had an Evicted Tenants' Association in Limerick endeavouring from meetting to meeting to make their cases heard through the length and breadth of the land but the Government who should have relieved them through a law passed in this House or a more liberal administration of the law in existence had steeled their hearts against them. £250,000 could with difficulty be voted in that House for their reinstatement, and, £250,000.000 was voted for an infamous war in South Africa to deprive the brave Boers of their lives and liberties. They had evicted tenants in the parish of Crean in his constituency on the Erasmus Smith and the Lloyd-Apjohn properties; they had them in Doon on the Erasmus Smith and Marshall properties; they had them in Herbertstown and Ballybricken on the Tuthill and Croker properties; they had them on the property of Lord Cloncurry in Furcaleigh, Rath, and Dromealy. They had evicted tenants in Knockling on an estate managed by Messrs. Robert and Charley Sanders. There were evicted tenants on the property of Parson Lee in Bettyville, managed by the notorious Ernest Brown and White, who took the palm as an evicting agent and worked the Ballynanty evicted farms for Smith, who inherited the principle of eviction from his father and grandfather. He wanted to know what progress had been made with the Mounshannan Estate, and with those tenants selected for migration into it.

Now about this matter of intimidation. He was aware that in the constituency he had the honour to represent the intimidation was all the other way. Last winter when addressing a meeting in Fedamore on the subject of acquiring untenanted land for the poor tenants and the labourers around there, the Mayor of Limerick and himself were surprised, on arriving in the little town, to find the walls placarded with intimidating notices stating that Mr. Peter Fitzgerald and some big functionary connected with the Court of Chancery would try titles with them over their right to address a public meeting on a lawful subject. Mayor Joyce, now here by his side, on this bench, set Mr. Fitzgerald's intimidation at nought. He did the same, and they had not heard since of Mr. Fitzgerald or his plank-bed proclamation. This Land Act of 1903 dealt with the question of town tenants if properly and honestly worked. They were endeavouring to buy out the town of Kilfinane from Colonel Gascoigne side by side with the rural tenants, and they were buying out the town of Cahirconlish as the residue of the Lefroy Estate, and they hoped that His Excellency's instructions to the Estates Commissioners would not debar the tenants rights under the Purchase Act. He believed that the Estates Commissioners were honourable and competent men prepared to act honestly and impartially as between landlords on the one side and the tenants, evicted tenants, and labourers on the other side, but their hands were virtually tied up.

The labourers, the poorest class of all, were shamefully treated when the Purchase Bill was going through this House. The then Chief Secretary promised a Labourers Bill on a liberal scale for 1904. *Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus.* The mountain in travail a miserable mouse is begotten. They improved the Bill upstairs in Committee. He proposed that the £233,000, the Exchequer Grant unused in the North should be turned up to Kilmallock, Tipperary, and Limerick Unions, so that it should not revert to the Treasury. The Chief Secretary at first partially assented; next at the bidding of the Orangemen put on time limit; next tergiversated more and more and finally withdrew the Bill. In an amending Act which would be passed by the Liberals when in office next year, they would be able to see that fair play was done by the evicted tenants and the labourers.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £83,315, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Lundon.*)

*MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.) said that, judging from the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite, one would be inclined to think that there was nothing wrong with the land legislation of 1903 except the scarcity of money. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh had said the best proof that the Land Act of 1903 had been a success was the fact that agreements for sale and purchase between landlords and tenants had been made, affecting property to the amount of £28,000,000 or £29,000,000. The hon. and gallant Member had not alluded to the fact that there were difficulties with regard to some of the main objects which the right hon. Member for Dover had stated as reasons for the measure. The right hon. Member had told the House when the Land Act of 1903 was before it that the principal objects of the proposed legislation were to increase the size of uneconomic holdings in the West, the giving to the people of Ireland a chance of living in decency and comfort in their native land, and the improvement of the land. Would the Chief Secretary tell the Committee whether the provisions with regard to the evicted tenants were working well. He believed it was impossible under this Act to increase the size of uneconomic holdings and to carry out improvements on the land, and he would like to know from the Attorney-General whether, after the decision of Judge Meredith, it was thought necessary to make some alterations in Sections 43 and 45 of the Land Act, 1903, in order to bring them into harmony with Section 12.

He remembered very well during the discussions on Section 12 in Committee that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover repeatedly refused Amendments from the Nationalist Benches, but promised that the words should be made so wide and so general that the Estates Commissioners would have the greatest possible amount of discretion. The right hon. Gentleman undoubtedly most faithfully kept to his undertaking as far as Section 12 was concerned, but unfortunately that section did not stand alone. The Committee stage of the Bill was not reached until well into the month of June. It was a long, complicated, and difficult measure, and the session had progressed so far before the 43rd and 45th Clauses were reached—clauses on which Section 12 was largely dependent—that they were allowed to pass practically without Amendment. And now, when they came to the practical working of the Act, they found that the learned Judge held that under Clause 12 the Estates Commissioners had power to make improvements on holdings whether sold direct by the landlord to the tenant or whether bought by the Estates Commissioners themselves. Yet when they came to Clauses 43 and 45 Mr.

Justice Meredith pointed out that there was no machinery provided under these two clauses by which money expended on improvements could be added to the purchase money. This applied especially in the case of estates which had never come into the possession of the Estates Commissioners at all. If that were so—and it appeared to be so from the judgment given—the whole machinery for improving uneconomic estates either in the West of Ireland or elsewhere was bound to prove abortive, as it was impossible for the Estates Commissioners to add to the purchase price the cost of the improvements. Again, they were told by the learned Judge that advances could not be made to the tenant purchasers, and therefore uneconomic holdings could not be improved. That gave no fair chance of a final settlement of the Irish land question. What was the opinion of the right hon. and learned Gentleman on that point? No doubt the Estates Commissioners possessed some powers with regard to loans for improvement, but in the name of goodness how could an impoverished tenant, in the occupation of an uneconomic holding, fulfil the terms of repayment? These agricultural slums were in fact the great difficulty in regard to the expenditure of public money for improvements, and they could not expect small tenants in any part of Ireland to comply with the conditions. They could not afford to pay more than 2¾ per cent. interest.

They were asked to allow the Chief Secretary's Bill to go through without the slightest opposition, but the fact was the right hon. Gentleman was obliged to acknowledge that its main provisions were completely nugatory. What powers had the Estates Commissioners to make a free grant to tenants where they purchased an estate direct from the landlord. During the passage of the Land Bill they were told that it was proposed not only to reinstate the evicted tenants, but also to give them a decent start in life, but no one suggested that a shilling of British money should be expended in the process. After the Boer War this House voted £3,500,000 for the reinstatement of the Boer farmers who took rifles in their hands against this country, but not a single penny was voted for the reinstatement of the wounded soldiers of the land war. Recourse was to be had to a reserve fund which had accumulated under previous Lands Acts. It was said that this fund amounted to about £240,000, and if the Treasury admitted that it was as much as that the actual sum was probably a great deal larger. It was from this fund the evicted tenants were to get free grants and loans to restart them in life. The Estates Commissioners, however, seemed to be extremely doubtful whether they had power to do this or not. He therefore asked the Attorney-General to say what he understood to be the present state of the law—whether he believed that it carried out the intention of the House and the policy the Land Act was supposed to embody. If it did not, Nationalist Members would be the veriest fools in Christendom to allow any amending Act to pass for the sole benefit of landlords, without getting some *quid pro quo* from the Government.

In any case he was not enamoured of the proposal to pay two-thirds in scrip and one-third in cash. The right hon. Gentleman had said that land stock would be worth about 92. Did anybody believe that the landlords would consent to lose 8 per cent. of their purchase money? He knew them too well to be under any delusion on that point. Where would it come from? Doubtless from the tenants. He would like the Attorney-General to say whether the preliminary agreements entered into on the form "Undertaking to purchase" were binding on both parties. He believed, as a layman, there would be considerable difficulty in compelling either landlord or tenant to carry out those agreements, and if they were not binding, the landlords, when they knew they were to get one-third in cash and the remainder in depreciated landstock, would declare the agreements no longer binding. Believing that prices were already too high, he was certainly not in favour of legislation which would have the result of increasing the price to the tenant farmer.

The great rush that had taken place on the part of tenant farmers to purchase was due to the desire to get rid of landlordism, and land hunger existed as keenly to-day as before the Act of 1881, but it was also due to another fact. Not 20 per cent. of the Irish tenant farmers were in a position to pay their rent to March 25th last and keep their land fully stocked, and the rush had taken place because they were in arrears with their rent; they were financially between the devil and the deep sea, and they knew that when the purchase agreements were entered into special arrangements would be made with regard to arrears. On the Leinster Estate the agent succeeded in getting the tenants to pay twenty-five years purchase because a half-year's rent was remitted and another half-year's rent added to the purchase price, so that for a whole year the tenants paid no rent. It was not a sound business transaction, and it was brought about in consequence of the unsound financial condition of the tenants themselves. Another point was that the section of the Act of 1903 with reference to the proper housing accommodation for the labourers had been an absolute failure, only an insignificant number of cottages having been provided. In conclusion, he would like the Attorney-General to say whether, where an estate was sold direct to the tenants, the Estates Commissioners were entitled to make a free grant; and whether, where an estate was bought by the Estates Commissioners and resold by the Estates Commissioners, they were entitled to make both a free grant and a loan for improvements.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) desired, in answering the Questions put to him, to make it quite clear that no opinion which he could give, in the House or elsewhere, had any binding force or authority whatever on the Estates Commissioners. He had steadily refused ever since the Act was passed to give, either directly or indirectly, any opinion to the Estates Commissioners upon points of law. By Section 23, Sub-section 28, of the Land Act of 1903 he provided a ready means by which they could always obtain legal directions upon any point that arose before them. They could go to their referee and get from him direction on any point of law they required, and they had availed themselves of this privilege on many occasions. It had always seemed absolutely repellant to him that by any advice given in secret to such a tribunal as the Estates Commissioners the rights of individuals should be affected, and decisions touching those rights given. Therefore, he had never given any advice to the Estates Commissioners, but had invariably said that they should take their law from the Judicial Commissioner, and not from him.

*MR. KILBRIDE: Have you ever issued any regulations?

MR. ATKINSON: Never. He had no power to do so, and he never saw any. The hon. Member opposite had asked whether, in the event of the Chief Secretary's scheme being adopted, the landlords would be able to put on the screw and get out of the tenants the difference between stock and cash. They would not be able to do that until the £28,000,000 of loans had been disposed of, and that was a long way off.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said it could be done in all new arrangements.

MR. ATKINSON said there were contracts for £28,000,000 of loans in front at present. They had been disposed of to the extent of perhaps £7,000,000 or £8,000,000, but even then there remained over £20,000,000 of contracts for sale. In most cases of direct sale those contracts were binding. Therefore, even assuming the landlord was as rapacious and the tenant as submissive as they were represented to be, and the sinner as anxious to extort from the saint as had been suggested, nothing could be done in that way until the greater part of those £28,000,000 had been disposed of. Another question was whether, in the event of an advance being made to a tenant who had bought direct from the landlord, the advance could be added to the purchase annuity. He did not think it could. But a part could be given as a free gift, and in addition the tenant had power to borrow from the Board of Works for the purpose of improving his holding, the money being repayable on easy terms by annuity. He had also power under the

Act of 1889 to buy additional land not exceeding ten acres to add to his holding, and could get an advance for that purpose. So that while under Section 3 of the Act of 1903 advances for the purpose of improving the holding could not be added to the purchase money so as to be repaid by purchase annuities, it could be done where there was a sale direct.

*MR. KILBRIDE asked whether it was not the fact that the Board of Works charged 6½ per cent. for twenty-two years.

MR. ATKINSON said he did not know what the exact terms were. When the Estates Commissioners bought direct they could undoubtedly expend money on improving the estate, sell the farm so improved at an increased price, and have that increased price repaid by annuity.

*MR. KILBRIDE: Can they make a free grant in that case?

MR. ATKINSON said as far as he could see there was nothing to require that some of the money advanced might not be given as a free grant.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Where a tenant buys direct from the landlord, has the landlord the right, within the zones or outside the zones, to add £100 moneyto the actual purchase so that he may get the bonus on it?

MR. ATKINSON: Of course not. He had intervened mainly for the purpose of dealing with the question of the regulations, which he thought had been vastly misunderstood. When the discussion upon this question arose, the hon. Member for Longford, and many others pointed out that it would be quite improper and intolerable that the Government of the day should intervene and direct the Commissioners how they were to act in isolated cases. On July 1st, 1903, the hon. Gentleman pointed out most forcibly and clearly that, while it might be proper for the Government to make general regulations laying down general principles of action, to attempt to interfere with the discretion of the Commissioners or to guide their action in individual cases would be absolutely intolerable and wrong. Yet scarcely a day passed but the Chief Secretary was asked to direct the Commissioners to reinstate some individual tenant, and to take action to expedite some individual purchase, or to restrain the Commissioners from doing some individual wrong. It would be monstrous if the Executive Government were to interfere with any tribunal of a quasi-judicial character in the daily discharge of their business, and to induce them to give priority of relief to one man over another. On the contrary, it was suggested that general directions should be given laying down principles of action. Such general regulations were given from time to time. His right hon. friend the Member for Dover was most anxious that new machinery of this kind should have a certain time to act, so that the defects might be seen, and then by some general regulations it could be put on the right line. He did not think that that system commended itself to hon. Gentlemen opposite. There were daily complaints that the regulations were not laid on the Table of the House. No regulations had then been made, but certain confidential communications had taken place. It was said that those communications were only of a tentative and confidential character, but he did not think the Answer was considered satisfactory. Ultimately the Chief Secretary published regulations which dealt, or sought to deal in a practical way with a most pressing problem. He thought it was much to be regretted that when one came to discuss the means to be adopted to deal with a difficult and pressing problem he should not get some credit for anxiety to forward a line of policy that had for the last twenty years been the policy of this Government, namely, the conversion of the tenantry of Ireland into peasant proprietors; and that credit should not be given for an anxiety to carry out the Act which was the culmination of that policy.

Now, what was the practical problem they had to deal with? They had contracts for sale representing £28,000,000. They had, he supposed, contracts representing £18,000,000 which there was no money to feed. A great deal had been said about it being an injury merely to the landlord. His sympathies were entirely with the tenant, because it meant a very considerable loss and inconvenience to the tenant. If the tenant's purchase was complete he would only have to pay 3¼ per cent., and 10s. of that per annum would go to the sinking fund. But while the interregnum lasted he had to pay 3½ per cent.—that was 5s. per cent. more and not a penny went to the sinking fund. So that the practical result was that he had to pay 5s. per cent. more than he would pay if the purchase were completed, and practically his term was lengthened by the interregnum, whatever that interregnum might be. Under that state of things could there be any greater injustice than to abstract from the money that would go to feed that purchase a sum to carry out purchases of a different character, and so by the amount abstracted prolong the agony of the tenant who dealt direct. Assuming for a moment that there were direct sales, representing £10,000,000, that the tenants in those cases were waiting for their turn to be reached, and that there was money to the extent of £5,000,000 a year to meet them, he said it was a wrong to them to abstract £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 from that fund and give it to vendors who were posterior in date to the vendors who sold to them. The first of the regulations was intended to prevent that wrong to the tenant by providing that no undue advantage, having regard to the date of the sale, should be given to one vendor more than another, so that a man who sold direct in 1904 should not be postponed to the man who sold to the Commission in 1905.

The hon. Member for Waterford had said that the regulation entirely prevented the sale of untenanted land. It did nothing of the kind. He considered the regulations most carefully with his right hon. friend, having in view the fact that if money was obtained it might be desirable to appropriate certain portions of it for sales of untenanted land and no unfair advantage would be given to anyone under the regulation. The object and intention of this regulation was simply to secure fair play and prevent the giving of any undue preference to one class of vendor over another. If this regulation was having the effect which had been put forward, of course it could be modified to-morrow, and if it was found that it was actually having any effect beyond that which the Government intended, namely, to secure fair play, nothing could be easier than to modify the regulation. They had a perfectly just and fair object in view, and, in his opinion, the regulation carried out that object.

There had been some unworthy suggestions that there was a disposition to defeat the benevolent purposes of the right hon. Member for Dover. No more unfounded accusation was ever made. He knew the feelings of the right hon. Member, he helped him through the entire of the Bill, and he could disclaim altogether that there was any desire whatsoever to defeat the Act; on the contrary, the regulations were drawn in the very spirit of his right hon. friend's public declarations. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover laid down three propositions for dealing with this question. The first was that there was to be no compulsion; the second, that there must be equal treatment for all classes of persons with whom the the Act would deal; and thirdly, that there must be no special mention of the evicted tenants. He wished to point out that the reinstatement of the evicted tenants was not the main purpose of the Act; it was an ancillary object in the great purpose of converting the tenants into proprietors. And was the Government to allow an Act which was designed to be voluntary to be made compulsory through intimidation and crime? It had been asked, Why apply it to the tenants alone? He had not done so. Intimidation was intimidation, no matter by whom practised. That was the practical question. Was the Government to stand by and wink at the crime of intimidation and boycotting, the meanest and most cowardly of all crimes? Were they to allow a voluntary Act to be turned into a compulsory one, or the machinery they had set up to be made an instrument through crime for turning the Act into a compulsory Act? It was their first duty to prevent it; and they never could prevent it if they allowed intimidation to be practised. Intimidation had been defined in at least half-a-dozen Acts of Parliament, and it meant putting a man in fear of danger or injury to himself or to his personal property, or forcing him into doing something which he was legally entitled to abstain from doing. There was no mystery about it at all. It was notorious that in a certain part of Ireland there was an organised system of endeavouring to get possession of certain lands, and the Government could not stand by and allow crime to be committed, although it might be committed for a good object.

There was no foundation for the assertion that tenants could be coerced into accepting bargains which they were not willing to accept under ordinary circumstances, and there was already power under the 10th Section of the Act of 1885 to set such bargains aside, and the Court had all the jurisdiction of a Court of Equity to set aside any contract brought about by duress. There was cheap and easy machinery by which every purchasing tenant could get relief from a contract that had been forced upon him by duress. There had been great misconception as to the regulations in regard to the reinstatement of evicted tenants. What the evicted tenant wanted was to get back to his old holding, among his old friends, and what he disliked was migration to other districts. All that the regulation did was to regulate the order of applications. It denied no man's right, and it took away no man's right; it merely postponed the case and laid down a rule of procedure upon it, so that the evicted tenant might have a chance of purchasing when the estate on which his old farm was situated was up for sale.

Objection had been taken to the practice of the dissenting Commissioner recording his views for the information of the Judicial Commissioner in cases which went before him for his decision. Surely, however, it was right that when two members of the Commission took a particular view on a point of law, the remaining Commissioner should be able to put his view also before the Judicial Commissioner.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said it was not right. It was to enable Mr. Wrench to put his view before the Commissioner.

MR. ATKINSON: If the dissenting Commissioner takes a different view to that of the other two Commissioners he is allowed to state his view in order that both views may be placed before the Judicial Commissioner. I think the statement just made by the hon. Member for South Tyrone is most unfair and most unjust.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I take the responsibility for that statement.

MR. ATKINSON said that in an ordinary Court of law the dissenting Judge had the opportunity of giving his view. It was most unfair, when a reference was given which might be in a form which one of the Commissioners thought did not fairly put forward his views, that he should not have an opportunity of putting in notes showing that he disagreed.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) said they had not complained of the publication of those regulations, but, on the contrary, always asked for them. He believed that the Attorney-General drew up the regulations, and that the Chief Secretary fathered them, but that the real authors were the Treasury. It would be strange indeed if the present Government did not try deliberately by regulations to defeat the object of their own Act. He was only giving a just amount of credit to those connected with the Government of Ireland when he said that he did not think they would have issued those regulations if in Ireland they had had supreme control in regard to this matter. The object of the Treasury always had been not to disturb the money market in England; and the interests of Ireland were subordinated to the commercial interests of Great Britain. The Government securities were low because of an infamous foreign policy which had been most costly to the country, and hence it was that the Irish Government, following Treasury instructions, worked the Act in the interests of the British Exchequer. That was the meaning of the whole thing.

The effect of the first regulation was to postpone certain purchases at the expense of others. It appeared from the Report of the Land Commission that it had been the practice to deal with cases as they came. If that was the case, what was the object of issuing the first regulation at all? It must have some meaning, and he claimed that it meant the postponement of purchases of those untenanted lands which were absolutely essential for the settlement of the most urgent part of the Irish land question. It appeared from a statement at page 17 of the Report that it was the practice of the Estates Commissioners to buy untenanted land until they were stopped by the Treasury. That, to his mind, explained the whole object of the first regulation. If the intention was to prevent the purchase of untenanted land, then he said that one of the prime objects of the Land Act of 1903 was assailed by this regulation, and they would have in ten years hence the same trouble in Ireland, or at least in parts, if they insisted on the regulation being carried out.

As to the second regulation dealing with intimidation, he really believed that it was put in to throw dust in the eyes of the landlords, a section of whom, the Government were pleased to think, had been attacking them for six months or more in respect to intimidation alleged to be prevailing in the West of Ireland. He felt certain that the Government did not believe a single word they said about intimidation. There was no intimidation in the sense in which the Attorney-General had explained it that night. No one had been put in fear as to person or property. Meetings had been held and strong declarations had been made as to the way in which the Land Act ought to be administered, but nothing more had been done. The Government could never carry out this regulation. The Attorney-General had not tried to give an Answer to the Question as to who was to inquire into the intimidation. What was to be regarded as intimidation? Who were the persons to decide? How were they to form their judgment? No Answer had been given to these Questions, and no Answer could be given. The intimidation clause was all humbug. He warned the right hon. Gentleman that no case could or would occur of a purchase being refused in the West of Ireland, where this intimidation was supposed to be rampant, without the fullest investigation in that House and elsewhere.

Mr. Clancy.

He wished to draw attention to the regulation dealing with town holdings—a matter of the first importance from the point of view of many people in Ireland. In the Land Act of 1903 express power was given to purchase town holdings when they constituted part of an estate which was otherwise mainly agricultural or pastoral. That being so, the question had been brought before Mr. Justice Meredith, and he had decided, as they should have expected, that the Act of Parliament meant what it said. He had decided that town holdings might be bought when they did not form the main part of an estate. Was it not extraordinary that the Government should think it necessary to warn the Estates Commissioners that, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Justice Meredith had given that decision, and that they were to have regard to certain other considerations before they sanctioned the purchase of town holdings, they were to have regard to the definition of a holding in the Act of 1881, which was not incorporated in the Land Purchase Act? The meaning of that, he contended, was that the Estates Commissioners were not to sanction the purchase of town holdings wherever they could avoid purchasing them. It was a fresh device of the Treasury to prevent the expenditure of money under the Land Purchase Act of 1903, even in cases where the Act of Parliament said, and a judicial decision said, that money might be justly expended. It seemed to him that where the regulations were not superfluous they were directly intended to prejudice land purchase, to stop it, wherever it could be stopped, in the interest of the Treasury, and at the same time to postpone the settlement of the most urgent part of the Irish land question—sales direct to tenants by landlords.

As to the Bill which the Chief Secretary had mentioned that night, all he could say was that he could not believe that the landlords were against it. He understood that the landlords at their convention did not accept the new proposal. But he preferred to regard the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh as a better spokesman of the landlords of Ireland. The point he wished to make was this. The Chief Secretary that night said that he had consulted only his own officials. He wished to know, if that statement was correct, how it was that the landlords had the proposal before them at their convention.

MR. WALTER LONG: Does the hon. Gentleman suggest that I made a statement which is not correct? He must know how the landlords came to know. It was because one of them, speaking in the House, said that this matter had been before them, and that they had brought it before the Government six months ago.

MR. CLANCY: The right hon. Gentleman appears to be rather heated.

MR. WALTER LONG: The hon. Gentleman stated quite clearly that I had made a statement which was not correct.

MR. CLANCY: I made a statement which I will repeat, and which I think is perfectly correct. I want to know—and I ask the Question publicly—Did the right hon. Gentleman consult anybody but his officials? I did not hear the right hon. Gentleman say that he did not.

MR. WALTER LONG: I stated that I consulted my officials in Dublin; I also consulted the representatives of the Treasury.

MR. CLANCY: The right hon. Gentleman has stated that he consulted the experts in Dublin Castle and certain officials of the Treasury. I ask him, did he consult anybody else? Did he consult the landlords?

MR. WALTER LONG: Really the hon. Gentleman is making a mountain out of a molehill. I have stated that this suggestion was brought before me directly I came into office.

MR. CLANCY: That is not an Answer.

MR. WALTER LONG: I have stated exactly what I did. I consulted my own officials and the officials of the Treasury.

MR. CLANCY: Does the right hon. Gentleman say that he did not consult the landlords or the representatives of the landlord body in Ireland? He does not deny it.

MR. WALTER LONG: It is useless to deny it if the hon. Gentleman will not accept any statement I make.

MR. CLANCY: If the right hon. Gentleman says that he did not consult the landlords or the representatives of the landlord faction in Ireland, then, of course, I do believe him, and accept the statement, but I do not understand him to make any such statement. Here we have the fact that the landlords in their convention discussed this proposal and apparently knew all about it before anybody else heard of it, and they refused to accept it. I want to know how the landlords heard of it. If the right hon. Gentleman did not consult them, did not an understrapper from Dublin Castle consult them? The hon. Member said one of the things which the Nationalist Members complained of was that in carrying on the administration in Ireland the right hon. Gentleman consulted the representatives of a small and dwindling faction while he neglected to take into his confidence his hon. friend the Member for Waterford, who represented the vast majority of the Irish people. This was only another instance showing that the Government of Ireland was carried on in the interest of one small dwindling faction.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) asked how came it to pass that regulations had been introduced with reference to the purchase of town holdings which practically substituted the regulation made by the Lord-Lieutenant under Section 230, Clause 8, of the Irish Land Act of 1903?

MR. ATKINSON, replying, said that under the Land Purchase Act and the Act of 1881 they could only advance money to buy a holding. That holding should be good security, and the difficulty was about the re-sale of small towns when they were bought. The intention of the Commissioners was that for the purposes of re-sale regard must be had to the security that was available for the amount advanced.

MR. WALTER LONG said he desired to say a word or two first of all about the proposals to which he made reference earlier in the evening as a method of escaping, temporarily at all events, from the difficulty in which they found themselves in connection with this Act. He was not surprised that those suggestions had been criticised, but he was surprised at the form which the criticism had taken. What surprised him more than all was the extraordinary suggestion that he had improperly, and with injury to the Nationalist Party, taken the landlords into his confidence on this proposal. What was the proposal? It was not a proposal which in any way injured the future ownership of the occupier, and it did not throw upon him any liability for the existing £27,000,000. All the Bill proposed to do was to enable the vendors to take stock in part payment, which under the Act of 1903 they could not do, it being obligatory that the payment should be made in cash. It would take more than one issue—at least two, he should think—before the present block could be removed. Therefore, they were a very long way from reaching the point where the landlord would be able to lay this heavy burden on the tenants. When he was accused of committing some heinous offence because he had consulted the landlords, he searched his memory to know what could possibly be the foundation of the charge. It suddenly occurred to him that he had an interview with representatives of the landlords in Dublin three or four months ago. They did not, however, come to represent anything injurious to the tenants of Ireland or anybody in Ireland connected with the land question. They came to represent that there was a block in the Land Commission proceedings, and that that block was caused by want of money, and they made a variety of proposals. He was new to the question, but he had had experience of a similar question when dealing with the London water companies, and he threw out a suggestion then and there, not in the least intending it to be confidential. He thought a way might be found out of the block. From that time to this the matter had been discussed in public, and it was absurd to suggest that he had been guilty of some act of bad faith or want of courtesy or fairness.

The hon. Member for Waterford misapprehended the effect of the regulation. If he had £5,000,000 in cash, plus the addition of stock, it was obvious that he would have £11,000,000 or £12,000,000 to deal with for the purchase of estates, and that they would be able to relieve the block in the Estates Commissioners' Court. He would also be able to deal with the works of the Congested Districts Board and with various other branches under the purview of the Estates Commissioners. He maintained that the regulation about priority could not be interpreted in the sense in which hon. Members opposite had endeavoured to interpret it. It was an order to endeavour to secure that justice should be done and that one claim should not have a year's priority over the other. That would not interfere in the slightest degree with the expenditure of the fund. If they were not to leave the Executive Government to indicate to the Commissioners in what order of priority they were to take cases, what other course would be open to them in dealing with all the cases. They were doing no injury to any particular class by issuing a regulation of this kind.

The hon. and learned Gentleman had waxed wrath about the intimidation regulation; but his right hon. friend the Attorney-General had dealt with that fully and he need hardly say that he endorsed entirely what his right hon. and learned friend had said as to the object of that regulation and as to the way it would be carried out. Some one had that afternoon made one of those unworthy suggestions of which they had so many. The hon. Member stated that this was an insidious attempt to defeat the policy, and to discredit the action, of his predecessor. What were the facts? The right hon. Member for Dover was invited by Lord Clonbrock to express the opinions of the Government on this question; and he wrote a letter in which he explained that the policy of the Government was identical with the policy to be found in this regulation. The hon. Member for Dublin County said that this was a new policy—something new—something that had never been heard of before in Irish land administration.

MR. CLANCY: I never said anything of the kind. I said that it was a device of the present Executive.

MR. WALTER LONG said it was stated by almost every speaker that this was a new departure of his, and that it was done behind the back of his right hon. friend the Member for Dover. He had shown that the right hon. Member for Dover had expressed his view on the subject. The Congested Districts Board, which was not controlled by the Executive, had issued precisely the same regulation, signed by every member of the Board. As to forcing this policy on the Estates Commissioners, they had simply declared that if intimidation were employed on a particular estate, they might not be able to deal with that estate. In the administration of a perfectly voluntary Act, no Government worthy of its name could stand by quietly and see the owner of land coerced by threats and boycotting into coming under the Act. The Government hoped to discourage such coercion by showing that it was a policy that would not pay. It might not be a very grand way of achieving the object, but he was surprised that his hon. friends opposite should denounce it by their criticism. Surely there could not be a better instance of the old saying that prevention was better than cure. The object was to prevent all these illegal methods and to show that they would not pay.

As to the number of appeals, thought they increased in 1903 and 1904, they had since shown a large falling off. The accommodation for the Estates Commissioners had been increased and the number of the staff had been added to. The sort of debate to which the House had listened was not encouraging to the British taxpayer. This Act was not two years old. It was passed with the assurance that it would be worked cordially on both sides, and now they were told that it had quite broken down, and that where it had been effective it had only been effective in the interests of the landlords. It was easy to make a statement of that kind, but it was not easy to support it. Under previous Acts which had been in force for twenty-three years they had expended £1,000,000 a year in land purchase, but under this Act they had expended over £4,000,000 a year. The allegation that too high a price had been paid to the landlords was surely met by the fact that the reductions had been on the whole reasonable. The average percentage of reduction of rent was 26·2 and the number of years purchase was 2·92.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Averages are very misleading.

MR. WALTER LONG thought he was entitled to give the averages. These should be regarded as really satisfactory.

They were told that nothing had been done in the West of Ireland. In regard to that matter hon. Gentlemen opposite were not quite fair. Before the Act passed, the Congested Districts Board dealt with 144,000 acres of tenanted land and 27,000 acres of untenanted land, or a total of 171,000 acres. Since the passing of the Act of 1903 they had dealt with 154,000 acres of tenanted land and 61,000 acres of untenanted land, or a total of 215,000 acres, as compared with 171,000 acres. When hon. Gentlemen opposite accused them of having deliberately interfered with the reinstatement of evicted tenants, he thought they were going too far. Every one would be glad to see the evicted tenants back on the land, even if they could not be reinstated in their original holdings, but hon. Gentlemen opposite knew that there were practical difficulties in the way of the completion of this work. The difficulties in connection with the migration of people to districts where untenanted land was available were almost insurmountable. He believed that under the Act they had created many peasant proprietors who were grateful to Parliament for the benefit which had been conferred upon them; but it was not only unreasonable, it was unfair and ungrateful to come to Parliament to-day and say the Act was a complete failure, and that nothing had been done to deal with the uneconomic holdings, when everybody knew perfectly well that the questions involved could only be dealt with by degrees. The Government had done nothing, either through their regulations or by their administration, except with the one desire to carry out the Act so that it might be a real benefit and blessing to the people of Ireland. He believed it was too soon to criticise the Act; but, even on the present short record, it showed good results, and that they were on the high road to doing satisfactory work in the interests of Ireland. Therefore, he asked the House to reject the Amendment.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Time, time. [Ministerial cries of "Order."]

Mr. WALTER LONG said he was bound to say, in view of the fact that he had purposely refrained from intervening in the debate so that hon. Gentlemen opposite might speak, that that was a most discourteous interruption.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said he regretted the interruption, but all the same the debate, which was a most important one, had not had the advantage of being listened to by many hon. Members opposite who were there now. He wished to disabuse the mind of the right hon. Gentleman that they on the Irish Benches considered him as a wicked Chief Secretary. They regarded him as a very innocent and ingenuous Chief Secretary, who, however, was the tool and instrument of Dublin Castle. He was perfectly certain that the right hon. Gentleman never said anything in the House which he did not sincerely believe, and that his intentions were honest. The right hon. Gentleman was, however, very inexperienced in the hands of the Castle bureaucracy, which was as hostile to the opinion of Ireland as the bureaucracy which led the Czar of Russia astray. While the Irish Members opposed the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman, they did not wish to strike at him, but at the officials. The right hon. Gentleman had claimed that the Act had succeeded, and in defence of that had said that so much more money had been obtained than was believed possible some time ago. That was perfectly true; but their complaint was, not that the Act was not proceeding with a good deal of speed, but that the money had been spent for the purpose of giving relief where it was least needed, and had not been spent where relief was most needed. In other words, the money had been spent in relieving well-to-do tenants and well-to-do landlords, while it had left untouched the sorely congested districts and the uneconomic holdings. The total amount of advances in Ulster was £561,962, in Munster £667,388, in Leinster £2,280,548, and in Connaught £299,000. That was to say, that the least money was spent in the poorest province, and by far the greatest amount spent in the richest province.

Their second complaint was—and the right hon. Gentleman apparently was rather disturbed by the statement—that the price of land was increasing. A remarkable instance of that was the Lake Foster Estate. On that estate the landlord and tenants agreed to fourteen years purchase, or £6,000 in all, but sanction to the agreement was refused on the ground that the land was not sufficient security for the £6,000. Since the passing of the 1903 Act the tenants came before Mr. Wrench and he fixed the price at £8,900, while the landlord, in addition, would get the bonus. The average under the Ashbourne Acts, without the bonus for estates, was seventeen years and a-half purchase; now under the present Act the average was, according to the right hon. Gentleman himself, 22·9 years purchase. He insisted that the Act had also failed in restoring the evicted tenants. Out of 4,275 evicted tenants only 221 had been restored to their holdings. He insisted that they must have full and adequate opportunity of discussing the Bill announced by the right hon. Gentleman, and that no measure should, in his opinion and in that of his friends, be brought in which did not accelerate the work of restoring the evicted tenants.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 199; Noes, 196. (Division List, No. 303.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Asquith,Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Baker, Joseph Allen
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Bell, Richards
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, N.E.(York,NRWhitby
Buxton, SydneyCharles(Poplar
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptE.C.(SAndrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,Sir FrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munto (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander(LanarkNE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flyn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler. Rt, Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth R. Leicester
Heath, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr.CharlesFredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jones, Leif (Appleby
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morley,Rt.Hon.John(Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col. JohnP. (Galway,N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth South
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow,W.)
O Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (RoscommonN
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parrott, William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestly, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, HerbertL.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, MajJ.E.B.(Isle of Wight)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)

Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George(York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas, Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJT.(Huddersf d
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner John S. Harmood-
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt.Hn.SirMichaelHicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bucther, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chaplain, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hon.SirJosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, RtHnAilwynEdward
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, RtHnSirR.B.(Invernss
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,Maj.Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Goulding Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hn. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Marq. of (L'nd'nd'ry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hn. Claude George
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir J. (Staffords. N.W.)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside)
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Hozier, Hn. James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir J. H.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool.
Lawson, Hn. H.L.W(Mile End)
Lee, Arthur H(Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter (Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt.HnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. R. Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym C. Guy
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S, Forde
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas T.
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, RtHn.Col. Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, AbelH.(Hertford, East)
Smith, RtHnJParker(Lanarks
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn. J.G(Ox'fdUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliam H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col A.C.E(Taunton
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne

Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E.R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Noes.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

When the Chairman announced the figures of the division there was vociferous cheering on the Irish and Opposition Benches.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Resign, resign.

Mr. JOHN BURNS (Battersea): You will want a tramway over the bridge yet.

Mr. FLAVIN: What is the Prime Minister going to do now?

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again to-morrow.

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.

Order for the Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

ADJOURNMENT.

*The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir A. Acland-Hood) (Somersetshire, Wellington) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I have, Sir, as may be expected, a very simple and obvious Question to address to the Prime Minister, and that is whether, in view of the defeat of the Government, he has any statement to make.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I think the House will probably anticipate my answer as easily as they have anticipated the Question put by the right hon. Gentleman. The Answer I have to make is that it is, of course, impossible for me on the present occasion to make any statement at all. [Cries of "Redistribution" from the Irish Benches.]

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I do not know whether the statement of the right hon. Gentleman means that he is adjourning until to-morrow or Monday his statement as to the course which the Government will adopt. I cannot conceive that his statement means that he intends to take no notice of this vote. He is the Leader of a Government which for nearly two years has had from every constituency to which they have appealed a declaration of want of confidence. And, Sir, he has taken up the position, to my mind the utterly unconstitutional position, that, no matter how the want of confidence in the Government may have been expressed by the constituencies, he would cling to his office so long as he was not defeated in this House. He has been defeated in this House; and, Sir, I say that if, disregarding the declarations of want of confidence in the country, he now elects to disregard the declaration of want of confidence in this House that he will be taking a course—[Ministerial cries of "No, no," and "Monday"]—I repeat the declaration of the want of confidence in this House—taking place the day after his meeting at the Foreign Office, when he called his Party together and appealed to them to save him from hostile divisions here—if he takes that course he will be taking a course not only out of record with the whole history of political Parties in this House, but a course which I say will be unworthy of a Leader of any political Party in this country. I ask the right hon. Gentleman before we separate to tell us what he means by saying that he cannot be expected at this moment to make any declaration. [Ministerial cries of "Monday."] If the right hon. Gentleman will say that on Monday he will make his announcement, then I am satisfied; but if his announcement means that he is going to swallow this humiliation as he has swallowed every rebuff for the last two years for the sake of attempting for a few miserable months or days to keep his Government in office; then I take the liberty of saying, with all respect to the regular Opposition, that the duty will be thrown upon them of using every means to bring to an end a state of things which is an outrage upon the constitution of this House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not sure whether the brief reply to the right hon. Gentleman opposite is to be taken as a speech. [General cries of "No, no!"] The hon. Member who has just sat down appears to have greatly agitated himself about a matter which will be settled in due time, but need not be settled to-night. He has denounced me in stentorian voice for having suffered every species of humiliation. I am not conscious of these humiliations.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: "Naked but unashamed." [MINISTERIAL cries of "Order," and interruption.]

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: To discuss the administration for which we have been responsible would be out of place on this occasion, but I may remind the hon. Gentleman and the House that until this evening my colleagues on this bench and myself have received the unfailing support of the Party, and that Party constitutes the large majority of the House of Commons. The hon. Member has quoted words of mine, and in quoting them has unintentionally misquoted them. I have said, and I am quite prepared now to repeat the statement if necessary, that unless it is possible for me to carry on the business of the country in this House with the dignity—[OPPOSITION ironical laughter and cheers]—with the dignity which I think should attach to every Government—[OPPOSITION ironical laughter and cheers]—and which certainly is not going to be disturbed by such interruptions in a moment of self-forgetfulness like those to which I have been treated—unless my colleagues and I can carry on the business of the country with dignity we certainly shall not attempt to carry it on. We have been defeated to-night, as many previous Governments have been defeated, upon a Vote in Estimates. Whether it will be our duty to repropose that Vote to the House—[OPPOSITION cries of "Oh," and MINISTERIAL cries of "Order"]—and ask it to reverse the decision which it has come to—a course which has often and most properly been taken by Governments—is a matter upon which I certainly am not going to pronounce without further consideration. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh."]

The hon. Gentleman was careful, I notice, in his speech not to suggest that the Government did not still continue to enjoy the support of a majority of this House—[OPPOSITION ironical laughter and MINISTERIAL cheers]—because he knows that by an accident—[OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh!" and interruption]—perhaps the House will allow me to finish my sentence—I admit an unfortunate one, they have been placed in a minority on a division. There will be an ample opportunity in a few hours to ascertain whether the Government does or does not enjoy the confidence of their supporters. [OPPOSITION cries of "With dignity."] But I entirely concede the point to the hon. Gentleman, if he desires it, that the mere fact, taken by itself, that on a vote of censure the Government can command a majority is not necessarily sufficient. I have never pretended that it was; I do not pretend so now. But neither is it a conclusive reason why a Government which does enjoy the confidence of a majority of the House should not continue its services to the country because they have been defeated by one vote in Supply. [An

HON. MEMBER on the MINISTERIAL Benches: In a small House.] Yes, Sir, but there would have been no difficulty in the Government to which the right hon. Gentleman refers, had they felt that they did enjoy the confidence of the House, in carrying on the effective constitutional procedure of having that vote reversed, and it is a matter of perfect notoriety, not denied by anybody that that has been done. If the right hon. Gentleman denies that——

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is not for me either to deny it or to admit it; and you have no right to ask it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR; Well, I think it is undesirable to put any Cabinet Minister into a position of having to affirm or to deny a point of that kind. It would have been better, perhaps, if that observation had not been made, for I quite recognise the obligations which impose a most proper silence upon right hon. Gentlemen opposite. I will, therefore, simply say that it was in the power of that Government to have challenged a reversal of that vote, but when we remember that their majorities had been going steadily down—[OPPOSITION ironical cheers, and cries of "Oh"]—and that they would probably not have obtained upon a vote of censure a quarter of the majority—I believe I am putting it much too high—that this Government has, it is natural enough that they should have decided not to reverse the vote, which they accordingly took as a conclusive reason why they should resign office. I am under no obligation to make any decision of the kind on the present occasion; the circumstances seem to me to be wholly different. I shall require to consult with my colleagues before announcing any decision to the House. Nor shall I give the decision to the House to-morrow morning, it being a Friday sitting, when we meet at twelve o'clock; and as it is, of course, impossible to take the Naval Works Bill, as originally arranged, because we have not obtained the Report of the money Resolution to-night, I shall put down the Scottish Churches Bill for to-morrow, and shall make an announcement of the course we mean to pursue at the meeting of the House on Monday.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I should be in order to move an Amendment. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] Being a consistent supporter of order, I respectfully submit that any question of order must be settled by the Chair, and not by a disorderly crowd opposite. I was about to ask whether it would be in order for me to move an Amendment to the Motion—namely, that the House should adjourn till Monday. It seems to me that, pending the consideration of the matter by the right hon. Gentleman and his Cabinet, it would be a perfect farce for the House of Commons to meet to-morrow for public business, when we shall not know until Monday whether or not the public business is any longer to be carried on by the present Government.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is not possible after midnight to move an Amendment to the Question that the House do now adjourn.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): Could not the First Lord of the Treasury himself move the Motion that the House do adjourn until Monday? [OPPOSITION cheers and MINISTERIAL ironical laughter.]

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I venture to suggest that it is obvious the House cannot meet for the discussion of business to-morrow. [OPPOSITION cheers and MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] And I submit to the right hon. Gentleman that he will consult the general convenience of the House if he will move an adjournment until Monday. [OPPOSITION cheers and MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no!"]

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The course suggested by the right hon. Gentleman is really an impracticable one. The Motion has been made and we cannot divide at this hour. [OPPOSITION cries of "Withdraw it."] But I further suggest that, as an announcement to-morrow will be quite impossible, and as the decision of the Government may, for anything I am at present in a position to say, be that we shall ask the House to reverse this vote and finish the business of the session—[OPPOSITION cries of "Dignity," "Oh!" and MINISTERIAL cheers]—I think it would be a pity not to spend to-morrow upon a subject upon which the whole House is agreed. I agree to ask it to deal with Party questions or matters upon which there was really a strong difference of opinion between the two sides of the House as such would not be a desirable course. On the Bill I am speaking of there may, of course, upon detail be some difference of opinion but there is no difference of opinion, dividing the two sides of the House, and I therefore think it would be a convenient course.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): Would it be in order for the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw the Motion for the adjournment and substitute a Motion for an adjournment until Monday?

*MR. SPEAKER: He would have to get the leave of the House to withdraw.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: May I, in reply to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, remind him that I think, if he will refer to the precedent already alluded to to-night, the precedent of the cordite Vote in Supply, he will find that other business was taken after that [OPPOSITION cries of "No!] before the final decision of the Government was arrived at?

MR. McKENNA: Is the right hon. Gentleman going to follow that decision?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: As the right hon. Gentleman refers to a matter in which I played some part, I may confirm what the right hon. Gentleman says. The moment that vote occurred and the division was reported, I moved immediately to report Progress, and other business was proceeded with for part of the evening.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That day, but not the next day.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before One o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 21*st July*, 1905.

VISCOUNT HAWARDEN.

Ordered, That the Report of the Lord Chancellor of the United Kingdom, made to the House of Lords on Thursday last, that the right of the Viscount Hawarden to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to his satisfaction, be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, together with a certificate stating that such Report has been made, and that the House has ordered it to be sent to the said Clerk of the Crown in Ireland.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Thames Conservancy.

And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14); Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill. A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

North Eastern Railway Bill; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. The order made on the 4th of July last appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bills, discharged.

South Barracas (Buenos Ayres) Gas and Coke Company Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill. Read 3^{a}, and passed.

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 1) Bill. Read 3^{a} (according to order), with the Amendments; further Amendments made. Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

London Government Scheme (Hackney and Edmonton Unions) Bill; London Government Scheme (London and Middlesex) Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 16th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 27th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^{a}; agreed to. Bills read 2^{a} accordingly, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to.

Esk Valley Power-Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Inverness Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill; Port Glasgow Improvement Provisional Order Bill. Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed.

Stonehaven Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Edinburgh Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

PAISLEY DISTRICT TRAMWAYS ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Marquess of Linlithgow.*)

LORD HARRIS, who had given notice to move, in the event of the Bill being read 2^{a}, that it be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, said: My Lords, I understand that clauses have been agreed to by the promoters which safeguard the interests of the National Telephone Company in the direction in which they feared they were threatened, and under those circumstances I shall not move my Motion.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and (pursuant to the provisions of the Private Legislation Procedure Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3ª on Monday next.

Glasgow Corporation (Tramways Consolidation) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order), and (pursuant to the provisions of the Private Legislation Procedure Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3ª on Monday next.

Glasgow Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order); Amendments made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill; North-Eastern Railway Bill; North-Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill; London Government Scheme (London and Middlesex) Bill; London Government Scheme (Hackney and Edmonton Unions) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; viz.:

D. Manchester.

E. Malmesbury.

E. Eldon.

V. Falmouth.

L. Kintore (*E. Kintore*) Chairman); agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Monday next, at Twelve o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3444. Costa Rica.

No. 3445. Germany.

No. 3446. Italy (Genoa).

No. 3447. Russia (Rostov-on-Don).

No. 3448. Egypt (Port Said and Suez).

No. 3449. China (Wuchow).

TREATY SERIES, No. 19 (1905).

Convention between the United Kingdom and the Netherlands providing for the settlement by arbitration of certain classes of questions which may arise between the two Governments; signed at London, 15th February, 1905 (ratifications exchanged at London, 12th July, 1905).

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.

Further correspondence relating to affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony (in continuation of [Cd. 2401] and [Cd. 2482]).

WEST AFRICA.

Returns of the Revenue and Expenditure (Actual and Estimated) of the West African Colonies and Protectorates, for the years 1885 to 1905-1906.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LONDON CORPORATION.

Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London, for the year 1904. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILLS.

MATRIMONIAL CAUSES BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1857. Was presented by the Earl Russell; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Monday the 31st instant. (No. 151.)

WEMYSS TRAMWAYS ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Wemyss Tramways. Was presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Sections 8 and 9); read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 152.)

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE'S MOTION.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: My Lords, in consequence of what took place in the House of Commons last night I desire to give a notice respecting my Motion which is down on the Paper for Monday next. I understand that on Monday next His Majesty's Government will be in a state of suspended animation until a certain vote of the House of Commons has been rescinded, if, indeed, it be in existence at all. In either case, there will not be on Monday any Government capable of advising the House with sufficient authority upon the important matters which I propose to bring before it. Therefore, it would be more respectful to the House that I should postpone the Motion of which I have given notice till a later day. I understand that Tuesday will not be in all respects convenient to your Lordships, and the Aliens Bill has been put down for Thursday next. If it were not a matter of urgency to proceed with the Aliens Bill on Thursday, it is possible that the Government might, with general consent, take my Motion on that day. In the absence of my noble friend the Leader of the House, no decision can be come to at the moment. It must be settled at a later period of the proceedings.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): With regard to the noble Duke's notice of Motion, he will do as he pleases about it; but I rather protest against the only alternative he presented to your Lordships as to what might take place on Monday.

LIGHT LOAD-LINE COMMITTEE.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to call attention to accidents and loss of life caused by the shifting of loose ballast carried by merchant vessels; to ask whether it is not a fact that in the case of grain cargoes merchant vessels must comply with official regulations to prevent shifting; and to move to resolve "That, in the opinion of this House, the Board of Trade should now take the necessary steps in carrying out the recommendation of the Light Load-line Committee that regulations to prevent the shifting of under-deck ballast carried by merchant vessels should be drawn up and enforced."

I have on many occasions brought to your notice the perils of the insufficient and inefficient ballasting of merchant vessels. These perils have unfortunately not ceased to exist, and if the lives of our seamen are sacrificed to mere considerations of economy or parsimony, I feel it incumbent upon me to bring the facts before your Lordships. You may remember that, after several efforts, I was able to convince your Lordships that at least a thorough investigation was necessary. That was the origin of the Light Load-line Committee which was fortunate enough to have as Chairman the noble Earl who leads the Opposition. As for myself, a certain number of shipowners seemed to consider me an enemy to shipowners, and, for some occult reason which I have never fathomed, as one who desired without cause to maliciously injure British shipping, whereas the shipowners of this country have no more sincere well-wisher than myself. I venture to think that I have shown this more than once.

But if I am a friend of shipowners, I am equally a friend of our merchant seamen. Their interests are allowed to go by the board simply because they have not the means, and are refused facilities, to enable them to voice their many claims and grievances in Parliament. It is our merchant seamen who are crying out against the risks they are required to run in many merchant vessels when sailing in ballast. They have ever regretted the fact that the proposition of a light load-line met with an adverse decision, but, undoubtedly, the feeling has been widespread that the prominence which the subject received has had most beneficial results. This has been admitted by many shipowners and by even the Board of Trade. Last year I brought before your Lordships a similar Motion to this one. My noble friend who was Chairman of the Light Load-line Committee said, in the course of the debate which ensued, that the Committee certainly did think that probably more could be done by the officers of the Board of Trade than had been done. With a hope that the Board of Trade would act more vigorously in the spirit of the recommendations of the Committee he did not think my Resolution should be pressed to a division. The noble Marquess who is Leader of this House hoped that, after the discussion which had taken place, and having elicited a distinct statement from the Board of Trade that the matter was one of which they were not losing sight, I would not press my Motion to a division. In deference to the noble Earl and the noble Marquess I withdrew it and entertained similar hopes to theirs. I must say, however, I had considerable doubts whether those hopes would be realised.

But I ask how long are we to be kept hoping? I have left a very generous interval for the Board of Trade to act more vigorously, and to carry out the unanimous recommendation of the Light Load-line Committee, but the position is exactly where it stood twelve months ago. There was not a single witness before the Light Load-line Committee who questioned the necessity of precautions to prevent the shifting of loose ballast. The representative of the Merchant Service Guild drew our attention to cases of disaster and loss of life which had, at Board of Trade inquiries, been put down to the shifting of loose ballast which had not been secured. He mentioned, for instance, the sad case of the "Moel Tryvan," which left Antwerp for Cardiff in tow. She had sand ballast and, bad weather coming on, the tug was unable to make any headway. The course was altered to make for shelter, but the "Moel Tryvan" broke away from the tug and fell into the trough of the sea. Her loose ballast shifted and she capsised and foundered with such suddenness that ten of the crew were unable to escape and lost their lives. This is a commentary on the ridiculous arguments which have been put forward that vessels coming round the coast in tow can take far greater risks in the way of the amount and the securing of their ballast.

It was with the object of preventing further unjustifiable sacrifice of life in this way that the Light Load-line Committee recommended the enforcement of measures to prevent the shifting of loose ballast. To the Marine Department of the Board of Trade it has been simply an empty utterance, and I ask your Lordships to support me in protesting against the contemptuous way in which the recommendations of Parliamentary Committees are treated by that Department. Since the recommendation of the Light Load-line Committee was made and ignored by the Board of Trade, we have had the case of the serious accident to the sailing-ship "County of Anglesea," bound from Rouen for Liverpool with silver sand as ballast. Meeting with bad weather, in almost exactly the same place as the "Moel Tryvan," she fell off from the wind and was struck by a sea and thrown on to her beam ends. A portion of the sand ballast was thrown up into the 'tween decks. Her steering wheel was smashed and the captain had to cut the main-topmast away to ease the ship. Two tugs eventually rescued her in this most perilous situation and towed her into Portland. There is no doubt that a considerable portion of this loose silver sand was thrown up into the 'tween decks, and there is no doubt that, had proper precautions been taken to prevent such an eventuality, this would have been an impossibility.

Anybody who studies the report of the Board of Trade inquiry into this disaster will see exactly what I mean; but, unfortunately, the report of the inquiry in this case is wrapped up in a good deal of unnecessary verbiage, and the reasoning contained in it in several places is open to a good deal of criticism. I will ask your permission to quote from a leading article in our first shipping paper, *Lloyd's Shipping Gazette*, which states as follows—

> "The result of the inquiry is not altogether satisfactory. For instance, the Court remarks that sand ballast appears to be the only material for the purpose obtainable at Rouen, and,

therefore, in this instance must be considered proper ballast. Does sand ballast become a proper material to employ merely because there is no other? Then we read that 'it would undoubtedly have been far safer had the sand ballast been carried in bags, but this method of stowage does not seem to be customary in the case of vessels leaving the port of Rouen.' Again, it may be asked whether it really matters what the custom at Rouen is if it is a wrong and improper custom? If it is unsafe, as the Court suggests, to carry sand in bulk, instead of in bags, on a voyage of this description, is it not better to say so out and out, and to be done with it? We regard this judgment as singularly feeble, and as calculated to suggest the inquiry whether it is really worth while going to the expense of these investigations if their practical consequences are to be so limited."

I give these remarks because they are the more significant owing to the line of strong opposition to me on the point of insufficient ballasting which has invariably been pursued by *Lloyd's Shipping Gazette*.

Subsequent to the inquiry into the accident to the "County of Anglesea," Lloyd's agent at Rouen made some rather astonishing revelations in a letter he addressed to the *Shipping Gazette*. At the Board of Trade inquiry at Liverpool the Court were led to suppose that ballast other than silver sand was not obtainable at the port of Rouen. Lloyd's agent at Rouen stated, however, that there was plenty of other ballast there, and the supply and cost of it compared favourably with that of the neighbouring ports. He informed the public that, as a matter of fact, the ballast which was carried on the "County of Anglesea" was, in reality, cargo on which no freight was paid and was loaded free of charge to the ship. We therefore see where the economy comes in in this case. I made it my business to communicate with Lloyd's agent at Rouen, and he was good enough to supply me with the following information—

"Silver sand is often supplied here to sailing vessels desiring ballast, and, naturally, as the same is placed on board, trimmed, and discharged free of expense to the ship, this ballast is much sought after. As I stated in my letter to the *Gazette* the sand, as far as the ship is concerned, may be considered as ballast, but it is, in reality, cargo which the owners take the opportunity of getting transported free of expense to the destination of the ship. I am of opinion, taking into consideration the nature of the sand, that when the same is shipped as ballast and therefore not an entire cargo taken, in the interest of the underwriters and safety of life at sea it should be loaded in accordance with strict regulations and the supervision of a recognised authority."

Here your Lordships have the views of an expert actually on the spot, and who had the "County of Anglesea" under his observation before she sailed.

I ask in all confidence whether we should continue to run contrary to such views? It is not as if the subject had any complication or difficulty about it; and the Board of Trade can adopt the necessary measures just as they did in the case of grain cargoes, where the danger of shifting is exactly similar. In furnishing your Lordships with the necessary details I have been compelled to trespass longer on your forbearance than I would otherwise wish. Not an atom of doubt exists as to the necessity of loose ballast being properly secured, but, unfortunately, there are shipowners who, to save money, will not take the necessary safeguards. Their own lives are not at stake, and in nineteen cases out of twenty the wheel of fortune turns favourably for them. Then comes along the twentieth case when the lives of our sailors are thrown away. Their wives and families are cast on the world, whilst the shipowner's loss comes out of the underwriter's pocket. Last year I had the qualified support of the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition, and also of the noble Marquess the Leader of the House. I trust that on this occasion I shall have a still stronger measure of their support. I am simply asking that, for the greater protection of life at sea, a recommendation coming from a Committee of your Lordships' House shall have the respect it demands at the hands of the Marine Department of the Board of Trade. I do not think I am unreasonable in this, and I hope that with the support of your Lordships we shall soon see that disasters at sea from the shifting of loose ballast are things of the past. I beg to move the Motion standing in my name.

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House, the Board of Trade should now take the necessary steps in carrying out the recommendation of the Light Load-line Committee that regulations to prevent the shifting of under-deck ballast carried by merchant vessels should be drawn up and enforced."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Duke of MARLBOROUGH): My Lords, I have listened with great attention to the speech of the noble Lord who has moved this Motion. I will not follow him through the various remarks he made, but I must take exception to one statement which fell from him—to the effect that the Board of Trade had treated in a contemptuous manner recommendations of a Committee of your Lordships' House. Many of your Lordships are intimately acquainted with the workings of the great Departments of State, and I am sure I am expressing the views of those who have that intimate knowledge when I say that they never on any consideration ignore or neglect the recommendations which a Committee of your Lordships' House make to them. I therefore heard with some feelings of regret the somewhat strong criticism which the noble Lord thought it necesary to deliver at the head of the Board of Trade.

LORD MUSKERRY: Not at the head of the Board of Trade, but the Marine Department.

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: It is exactly the same thing. Let me remind your Lordships what was the recommendation of the Committee on this subject. The Committee, at the conclusion of their Report, stated that they confidently relied upon the Board of Trade to use the powers already conferred upon them by Parliament to prevent the improper or insufficient ballasting of ships.

LORD MUSKERRY: Will the noble Duke read further on.

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: I will come to that presently. On that recommendation the Board of Trade issued special instructions to their survey staff to exercise most carefully the wide powers already possessed by them with regard to the detention of ships deemed to be unsafe by reason of insufficient or improperly-secured ballast. They issued warnings on the subject to shipowners, to masters, to the associations of shipowners, to shipbuilders, and to registry societies, local marine boards, and other bodies. Indeed, a Paper has been laid on the Table of your Lordships House, and is no doubt in the possession of the noble Lord himself, showing the action taken by the Board of Trade with regard to the recommendations of the Select Committee, and a perusal of that document will show that the Board of Trade at once took action upon the Report. The Committee further recommended that it was the duty of the Board of Trade to apply at once to Parliament if they considered an extension of their powers necessary in the public interest. I have to inform the noble Lord, on behalf of the Board of Trade, that they do not consider it necessary to ask Parliament for an extension of their powers. There are, as the noble Lord is aware, the widest and fullest powers granted in the Merchant Shipping Act to the detaining officers and surveyors.

The noble Lord is, I have no doubt, familiar with the provisions of that Act, and I will not trespass on your Lordships' time by reminding you of the powers which the detaining officers and surveyors possess; but I may say that they have ample powers of dealing with the sending of unseaworthy ships to sea. This offence is considered a misdemeanour, and they have power to deal with it. They also have powers with regard to the obligation of shipowner to crew with respect to reasonable efforts to secure seaworthiness, and powers to detain unsafe ships. In fact, there is regular machinery in existence, under the Merchant Shipping Act, by which provisions have been created enabling the detaining officers and surveyors to thoroughly superintend and examine the ships leaving our ports. I gather from the remarks of the noble Lord that he does not quarrel with the powers possessed by these officers, but would like, in addition, that they should be given specific regulations which they could enforce in the exercise of their duty. I am informed that the Board of Trade do not in any way consider this necessary. Furthermore, they are confirmed in their opinion when the list of casualties which have happened to ships in ballast is examined.

The noble Lord dwelt eloquently on the loss of life; I am sure we all regret that loss of life. But I must remind the House that in the seventeen years down to 1901 the average number of vessels lost each year in ballast was fifty-nine, and the average number of lives lost, ninety-nine; but in the four years from 1901 these figures have fallen to thirty-eight and fifty-nine respectively, that is to say, with regard to vessels there has been a reduction of 35 per cent., and with regard to loss of life a reduction of 40 per cent. That seems to me to show that the measures which have been taken by the Board of Trade's detaining officers and surveyors have had the effect of producing the results which the Committee over which the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition presided aimed at. I gather that it was the view of the Committee that only when it was shewn that the powers possessed by the Board of Trade were insufficient to grapple with this problem would it be advisable for them to apply to Parliament for an extension of those powers. Since the loss of ships and of life has been so materially and considerably reduced the Board of Trade are of opinion that the powers they possess have been proved to be adequate to grapple with the problem of the shifting of ballast, and they do feel some confidence that they are producing the results which the Committee desired without asking from Parliament an extension of their powers.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, as the noble Duke referred to me as having been Chairman of this Committee, I feel it right to say a few words. There was a doubt expressed as to whether the Committee had power to inquire into this question of under-deck ballast, but in our instructions we were clearly directed to consider whether, and to what extent, British ships were sent to sea in an unseaworthy condition by reason of their being insufficiently or improperly ballasted. That, I contend, gave full power to the Committee to investigate this matter. The noble Duke has answered to some extent the speech of my noble friend, who was also a member of the Committee, and who has followed up this subject with the greatest possible assiduity in the interests of the merchant service. It is curious, but a paragraph will be found in our Report showing that the Board of Trade declared that their detaining officers, although they frequently warned owners and masters whose vessels appeared to be improperly or insufficiently ballasted, had never detained ships sailing in that condition. I am not sure whether that still remains the case. I understand that it does, and that they do not detain ships. The noble Duke informed the House that the number of lives and ships lost on account of insufficient or improper ballasting was less now than when we were inquiring into the matter. I am very glad to hear that. I quite admit it is not always easy to account for the loss of a ship, and it may not be proved that the ship was lost entirely on account of insufficient and improper ballasting. I certainly have no reason to alter the opinion which the Committee formed—I do not know whether Lord Muskerry joined us in it—that we did not think the necessity of fresh legislation had been proved; but I sincerely trust that the Board of Trade will be more active than they were. There have been a good many ships found improperly ballasted, and I should like to ask why the Board of Trade do not detain those ships. This is a most important matter, and I would press on the Board of Trade the necessity of urging their officials to do all they can to prevent insufficiently and badly-ballasted vessels from going to sea.

***THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH**: I may tell the noble Earl, for his information, that not a single case has occurred in which it has been found necessary for the officers of the Board of Trade to detain a ship.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I should like to say a few words in reply. I would recall to your Lordships the statement of the late Lord Norton in this House, that if one sailor's life was lost from a cause which legislation could prevent, that legislation should be passed. I have said nothing about the proposed legislation for a light load-line, but have referred entirely to the regulations which the Committee recommended should be made by the Board of Trade to prevent the shifting of under-deck ballast carried by merchant vessels. The Board of Trade have not drawn up and enforced such regulations — regulations not for telling owners and captains they ought to secure that their ships are properly ballasted, but for seeing that that is done. When grain cargoes are shipped the Board of Trade do take precautions. They see that proper shifting boards are there, and that the grain is toned down so that the cargo shall not shift. But they have not taken any precautions as yet against the shifting of loose ballast. They have not carried out the recommendation of the Committee of your Lordships House. The noble Duke defended the Board of Trade very well indeed, but I must take exception to his statement that they have done all in their power in this matter; for they have not. I quite agree that they need not get fresh powers; they could do what is required without, but they have not done so. I shall press my Motion to a division.

Earl SPENCER: Perhaps I ought to say that if the noble Lord goes to a division I am afraid I shall not be able to divide with him, as I do not think he has sufficiently proved his case.

On Question, resolved in the negative.

ALIEN APPRENTICES ON BRITISH SHIPS.

Lord MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to ask whether His Majesty's Government are aware of the fact that it is becoming a common practice for British sailing ships to carry apprentices who are foreigners; if so, whether, in their opinion, it is not probable that on completion of their qualifying time these foreign apprentices will present themselves for examination for certificates enabling them to officer and command British vessels; whether they propose to take any steps in the matter; and whether they are keeping statistical records as to the numbers of alien apprentices who are engaged by British shipowners.

*The Duke of MARLBOROUGH: My Lords, I have to inform the noble Lord, in reply to his first Question, that it is a fact that a certain number of foreign apprentices are carried on British ships. The number has not greatly varied in recent years, and last year—1904—the foreign apprentices numbered only forty-five out of a total of 1,167. As to the second Question, it is not possible to state definitely the object for which these apprenticeships are entered into, but no doubt in some cases it may be with a view of obtaining certificates in our mercantile marine. In other cases it is probably with a view of gaining experience in sailing ships which may not be available to them in the countries of which they are natives.

PUBLIC ROADS (IRELAND) BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of DUNRAVEN: My Lords, the object of this Bill, which has come up to your Lordships from the other House, is to give to county councils in Ireland powers which are possessed by county councils in Great Britain. It provides that where extraordinary damage is done to roads by extraordinary traffic, or vehicles of excessive weight, county councils shall have power to recover from the persons who have caused the excessive damage. There is, of course, the usual right of appeal, and a limitation of time within which proceedings can be taken. Several Amendments were moved to the Bill in the other House by the Attorney-General for Ireland, and were accepted; the Bill passing without opposition. The Bill, as I have said, merely gives to county councils in Ireland the same powers in this respect as are enjoyed by county councils in Great Britain, and I hope your Lordships will consent to the Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Earl of Dunraven.*)

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, I have to say, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, that there is no objection to the Second Reading of this Bill. But while we accept the principle of the Bill on Second Reading, we reserve to ourselves the right to move Amendments should it be thought necessary to do so at a subsequent stage.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND) BILL.

Read 3^a (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

THE POSITION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON, who had the following Motion on the Paper—"To call attention to two Papers recently presented on the subject of Indian Army administration, and to move for further Papers," said: My Lords, after what took place last night in the House of Commons it seems to me that it is not advisable that I should bring forward a discussion of such importance to the interests of India as that which I had intended to submit to your Lordships, and I shall therefore not proceed with the Motion on this occasion, but will bring it forward on a future day as soon as I see an opportunity.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): The noble Marquess, of course, is entitled to put down his Motion for any day that is convenient to him. At the same time I must say that I do not entirely follow the train of thought which leads him to believe that no useful discussion can take place in your Lordships' House on a matter of very great public interest because of events in the other House.

EARL SPENCER: I shall not make any comment now on what the noble Marquess has said, but I propose to ask him a Question on the adjournment of the House.

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I venture to ask the noble Marquess a Question of which I have given him private notice. I had intended to put the Question at half-past four, but the noble Marquess was detained elsewhere at that hour. I should have been content merely to ask the Question of which I had given notice—namely, whether the noble Marquess had anything to tell the House in regard to the position of the Government in consequence of the vote which took place in another place last night—but when Lord Ripon said that he should postpone the consideration of the important matter which he had intended to bring forward the noble Marquess rather implied that that vote last night had very little effect on your Lordships' House, and that this House could with advantage, discuss any important matter that might be brought before it. I venture to challenge the noble Marquess's contention; and I think that here I might claim the support of the noble Duke who gave notice earlier that he proposed to postpone the Motion of which he had given notice for Monday. That vote last night has made a very important difference in the position of His Majesty's Government. I do not know whether the noble Marquess can inform us what the Government is going to do: I am not going to press that question; but I would point out that the vote last night in another place was taken on a matter of great importance—in fact, upon the policy of His Majesty's Government in Ireland—and that the Government were defeated, not in a snap division, but somewhere about twelve o'clock, when a whip had been out, and all preparations for a division had been previously made. I do think that that is a very serious matter, and that it puts His Majesty's Government in a very serious position. Of course, we know that there are various alternatives. The noble Duke mentioned two, and the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack said that there was a third. I can hardly imagine what that can be.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY: The noble Earl is mistaken. I did not say there was another. I said that I did not agree that the alternative mentioned by the noble Duke was the only alternative.

EARL SPENCER: I think that the Government may be said to be in a semi-animate position at the present moment, until they have been reanimated and revivified by a vote, and have become again a Government with, I suppose, a majority in Parliament. I think that what I have said is sufficient to justify me in declaring that His Majesty's Government is not in that position of influence now which would enable them to give a decisive and important Answer to any Question which may be brought before them. That is the first Question I should like to ask the noble Marquess, and I should also like to know what business he proposes to the House for next week.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, the noble Earl was good enough to say just now that he was going to ask me a Question of which he had given me private notice. He may have done so, but I have not received it.

EARL SPENCER: I am very sorry, but I sent a note to the noble Marquess's house, and I rather gathered from his gesticulation when he came in that he had received it. I sent it this morning.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am glad to have cleared up the misunderstanding, but I have not received the note, although I was at my own house until nearly two o'clock this afternoon. The noble Earl's Question, as he called it, consisted in great measure of a disquisition upon the position in which your Lordships' House finds itself in consequence of an adverse vote in the other House of Parliament. My Lords, that is a question into which I am certainly not going to enter. I will only say in reference to what fell from me just now in answer to Lord Ripon that the only argument which I intended to use was that, so far as my apprehension went, there was no reason whatever why, on account of an adverse division in the House of Commons, the House of Lords should not discuss the extremely important question which the noble Marquess had put on the Notice Paper. I still for the life of me cannot see any reason why the noble Marquess should not deliver his comments and we should not deliver our explanations, because the noble Marquess has not, after all, put down any notice of Motion on the Paper, but proposed merely to call attention to the correspondence.

Now, I should say that the whole of the noble Earl's proceeding was of the most irregular description. I have always understood that in this House, either under the Standing Orders or in accordance with well-established rules of business, we were not in the habit of commenting upon the proceedings in progress elsewhere, and the whole of the noble Earl's speech therefore seems to me to be of a somewhat unusual description. Then he asked me whether I can make any statement in regard to the course of business next week. If the noble Earl has been paying attention to these proceedings he must have seen that the Prime Minister has announced his intention of making a statement in the House of Commons next Monday.

EARL SPENCER: No.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The noble Earl has not seen that?

EARL SPENCER: Oh, yes, yes, I beg pardon.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I was going to say that the noble Earl must have taken singularly little pains to make himself acquainted with the facts of the case. But that being so, the Prime Minister having announced to the House of Commons and the public that he will, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, on Monday next make a statement, a statement which obviously must be of a most important character, upon this subject, surely the noble Earl cannot expect me on the previous Friday to anticipate that statement by a premature account given by myself of the intentions of His Majesty's Government. I must respectfully—I shall never deal with the noble Earl otherwise than respectfully—I must respectfully decline to answer the Question which he has asked me.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at half-past Five o'clock to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 21*st July*, 1905.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WEST AFRICA.

Copy presented, of Returns of the Revenue and Expenditure (Actual and Estimated) of the West African Colonies and Protectorates for the years 1885 to 1905–6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN BILL.

Copy presented, of the Unemployed Workmen Bill, showing how the Bill would run if the Amendments, of which Mr. Gerald Balfour has given notice, were made in it [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Chamber of London. Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London for the year 1904 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 255.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Sale of the Tenant's Interest in Termon Holding on the King-Harman Estate.

Mr. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners can state which official or other person employed by them was responsible for informing the representatives of the National Bank that the proposed sale by them to ex-County Inspector Scott of the tenant's interest in the Termon holding on the King-Harman Estate could not be proceeded with; and whether the Estates Commissioners sanctioned this proceeding, and, if so, for what reason.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The solicitor of the National Bank was informed by the Commissioners that, before coming to any decision as to the proposed sale to Mr. Scott, they would have an inspection and inquiry made. Inquiry was made accordingly by their inspector, and, on his report, the Commissioners decided to acquire the lands themselves in order to enlarge adjacent holdings. The lands were accordingly purchased by the Commissioners as untenanted land, and, upon the re-sale, twelve acres and a house were offered to Mr. Scott, but were refused by him.

The Irish Land Act, 1903.

Mr. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the total amount of money applied for since The Land Act, 1903, came into operation to the present date; what is the aggregate rental of the holdings for the purchase of which the advances are sought; also the Poor Law valuation of the lands comprising such holdings, exclusive of other hereditaments thereon; what amount of land stock the Treasury would require to float at the same rate of discount as the last flotation in order to meet the advances applied for plus the bonus and any other charges borne by the State; and how many years purchase of the rental and valuation respectively would the amount required represent.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I beg to refer the hon. Member to the general statement on this subject which I made in Committee of Supply on the Land Commission Vote yesterday.

Assistant Clerks of over Six and under Ten Years Service in Public Departments.

MR NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the number of assistant clerks (new class) of over six years service, but not exceeding ten years, now serving in the public departments; and also to state what actual benefits under the recent scheme these clerks at present enjoy.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I have not the details desired by the hon Member. As regards the second portion of his Question, I would refer him to my reply on the 17th instant†.

Exclusion of Foreign Prison-Made Goods.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether there has been any increase in the amount of foreign prison-made goods excluded since his last statement; and, if so, will he state the amount.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) There has been no increase since my last statement.

CHURCHES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair].

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I rise for the purpose of moving that you, Mr. Chairman, do report Progress. I do not imagine that the situation requires explanation. The short discussion last night showed that there was a strong feeling on the part of many Members of the House that the House should adjourn until Monday, and I hope that a night's reflection will have brought to the same conclusion many of those who on the spur of the moment did not realise the necessity of that course. Sir, His Majesty's Government is now considering with due solemnity and deliberation the question whether they should retain their offices. They have until Monday for that purpose. It is almost unseemly, as it seems to me, for the House of Commons to be invited to transact business during what is substantially, if not really and ultimately, an interregnum. On the occasion, a few years ago, when a Vote in Supply caused the resignation of the Government of which I was a member, that event happened on a Friday, so that there was a convenient Saturday and the early part of Monday for the consideration of the position of the Government. That is not literally to be quoted as a positive precedent for this case, but I am sure that on consideration the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House must have seen that it is at once the most dignified course, and the course most in accordance with usage and with the general conception of the prevailing relations between the House and the Ministry, and I think he must have come to the conclusion that it is better that we should adjourn until Monday. I earnestly hope with regard to the Bill on which we are engaged that it is in no danger whatever of being lost by lapse of time. It has been subjected to many delays, but the parts of the Bill which are really urgent and necessary for the purpose of maintaining peace and restoring the general principles of equity in Scotland have already passed through Committee in this House, and I feel perfectly certain that there will be no idea of endangering the fate of that measure if we miss this day, which has come to it accidentally, and suspend the proceedings of the House until Monday, when we shall have a statement from the Government as to the course they intend to pursue.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

---

† See page 859.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.); If I dissent in important particulars from the recommendation made by the right hon. Gentleman, I think I shall do so on grounds which will appeal to him and to those who sit behind him. He touched lightly upon precedent, and especially the precedent in which he and his friends were nearly concerned, the cordite Vote of 1895. But if he will remember, on that occasion the Government of the day did proceed with business up to the very limits allowed by the Standing Orders of the House. They adjourned Supply and they continued to deal with the Bill which I should certainly be reluctant to take to-day, because I regard it as too controversial. But they did not regard it apparently as controversial in 1895, and they went on with the Naval Works Bill after their defeat in supply.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman excuse my interfering. They followed the business of the day, and they transacted the business of the day, as we did last night after this vote was taken. We went through the Orders of the Day. So did the Government of 1895. But that is a very different thing from having an entirely new day, with new matter before it, interpolated between the event and the decision to which that event gives rise.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is quite a new view of operative business in this House that the reading through of the Orders of the Day by the Speaker in the Chair, and the Treasury Whip saying "To-morrow," or "This day," or "This day week," should be regarded as transacting the business of the House in the sense which alone is relevant to this discussion. The fact is, that after the defeat of the right hon. Gentleman's Government in 1895, they proceeded to carry on legislation. They certainly carried on legislation on the same day. I have some reason to think they carried on legislation even on the Monday. A friend of mine who has refreshed his memory in regard to this transaction so informs me. Therefore the analogy breaks down in every particular. In fact, the analogy conclusively proves that the House of Commons is in a fit state to do the business in the interval between the vote and the time when the Government make the announcement to the House of the course they intend to pursue. I shall not ask the House to take business of a Party character to-day. I do not say that I should not be justified in doing so, but I shall not think of doing so as a matter of fact. I shall not press the House to work through the Orders of the Day, but I do think it would be extremely inconvenient if we were not to take this opportunity to go on with a Bill which is in no sense a Party measure, which has received a very large measure of support from both sides of the House, and which it is in the highest degree important should be got through its remaining stages as quickly as possible. Therefore, I would ask the House to consider exactly the situation as it is presented to us by the right hon. Gentleman, with his facts corrected as I have ventured to correct them, from a reference to what took place in 1895. According to precedent, the House did actually legislate in 1895 upon a matter which, if not controversial, then hon. Members have tried to make as controversial as they could ever since. All I am asking the House to do in the brief interval which will separate the vote of twelve o'clock last night from the statement which it will be my duty to make at half-past two on Monday—and surely it is only reasonable that I should ask them to do it—is to do business which does not arouse Party passion, which does not touch the question of resignation or non-resignation, but which will prevent a Parliamentary day being wasted at a moment of the session in which, whoever may be in power, and whoever may have the conduct of public affairs, Parliamentary days are worth their weight in gold. I think it would be neither in accordance with precedent nor in accordance with common sense that the House should refuse to take the course I very respectfully urge upon it. I think the feeling of the right hon. Gentleman is not to throw any obstacle in the way of a Bill which, I am sure, he desires to see passed, and which all

Scottish Members agree in desiring to see passed, and which I think may be passed through what remains of the Committee stage in a very brief time. If the House desires after that to adjourn, I shall not dissent.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I recollect the occasion in 1885 when the Government of Mr. Gladstone was unexpectedly defeated. Mr. Gladstone then moved that we should adjourn over the next day, which was Wednesday and not a Government day, and therefore a day on which controversial matters did not arise.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If I may remind the right hon. Gentleman, what the Government of 1885 was defeated on was the Budget, and a defeat on an essential part of the Budget, if not always—not perhaps, usually—regarded as decisive of the fate of a Government, is at all events of much greater importance than a defeat in Committee of Supply.

Question put, and negatived.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Postponed Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Mr. A. J. Balfour.

MR. BRYCE: Let me take the opportunity of saying that my hon. friends who are opposed to Clause 5 and to the schedule have allowed them to go owing to the exceptional circumstances of the moment. It is only right to say that they reserve their right to oppose this clause on the Report stage and also the questions which in deference to the general feeling of the House they do not now contest.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 281.]

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): The farce is ended now.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir A. Acland-Hood*) put, and agreed to:

Adjourned accordingly at twenty-eight minutes after Twelve o'clock, till Monday next.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXLIX.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the Lords.

(A.) House of Lords.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Agricultural Rates Act 1896, etc., Continuance	*Lord Kenyon*	Read 3^a and passed 11th July (220)
*Aliens	*Lord Belper*	Read 1^a 20th July (1299)
Coal Mines, Weighing of Minerals	*Lord Newton*	Read 2^a 13th July (512) Committee Report } 18th July (1019)
Compensation for Damage to Crops	*Lord Newton*	Read 2^a 20th July (1300)
*Consolidated Fund (No. 2)	*Marquess of Lansdowne*	Royal Assent 11th July (213)
Convocations of the Clergy [H.L.]	*Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*	Second Reading (adjourned) 14th July (719)
*County Courts (Ireland) [H.L.]	*Lord Ashbourne*	Read 1^a 14th July (686) Read 2^a 20th July (1304)
Drunkenness (Ireland)	*Earl of Mayo*	Read 1^a 10th July (4) Read 2^a 14th July (733) Committee Report } 17th July (844) Read 3^a and passed 21st July (1513)
Matrimonial Causes [H.L.]	*Earl Russell*	Read 1^a 21st July (1500)
Medical Acts (1886) Amendment		Read 1^a 20th July (1299)
*Mr. Speaker's Retirement		Royal Assent 11th July (213)
Public Meetings (Facilities) [H.L.]		Report 13th July (512) Read 3^a and passed 14th July (733)
Public Roads (Ireland)	*Earl of Dunraven*	Read 2^a 21st July (1512)
Royal Declaration [H.L.]	*Viscount Landaff*	Read 1^a 10th July (4)
Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies)	*Lord Ludlow*	Read 2^a 11th July (216) Committee 17th July (848) Report 20th July (1299)
*War Stores Commission	*Earl of Halsbury*	Report Read 3^a and passed } 10th July (58) Royal Assent 11th July (213)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Advertisement Regulations [H.L.].	*Mr. Bond*	Read 1° 17th July (902)
*Aliens	*Mr. Akers-Douglas*	Committee 10th July (110) (163) Committee 11th July (289) (333) Report 17th July (903) (957) Report 18th July (1137) Read 3° and passed 19th July (1257)
Canals (No. 2)	*Sir J. Brunner*	Bill withdrawn 17th July (992)
Carts (Ireland)	*Mr. Boland*	Read 1° 17th July (903)
*Churches (Scotland)	*Mr. Scott Dickson*	Read 2° 12th July (415) Committee 18th July (1089) Committee 21st July (1519)
*Crown Lands	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Bill withdrawn 17th July (992)
Corporal Punishment Restriction	*Mr. Lloyd Morgan*	Read 1° 10th July (110)
*East Indian Loans (Railways)	*Mr. Brodrick*	Read 1° 18th July (1164)
*Education (Scotland)	*Mr. Scott Dickson*	Committee 14th July (745) Committee 19th July (1209)
*Irish Education (Afflicted Children)	*Mr. Walter Long*	Read 1° 11th July (273)
*Local Authorites (Transfer of Treasury Powers)	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Bill withdrawn 17th July (992)
*Lunacy	*Sir R. Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 18th July (1164)
Medical Act (1886) Amendment	*Gen. Laurie*	Committee } 10th July (211) Report } Read 3° and passed 18th July (1164)
*Musical Copyright	*Mr. Cochrane*	Read 1° 11th July (273)
National Monuments in Churches	*Sir E. Lees*	Read 1° 19th July (1193)
*Naval Prize [H.L.]	*Sir R. Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 17th July (992)
*Prize Courts [H.L.]	*Sir R. Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 18th July (1164)
Public Library Acts Extension	*Sir J. Rankin*	Bill withdrawn 17th July (992)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Public Meetings (Facilities) [H.L.]	*Mr. Paulton*	Read 1° 17th July (902) Read 2° 19th July (1295)
Public Schools Act (1861) Amendment (Vincent Square)	*Dr. Macnamara*	Read 1° 10th July (110)
Relief of Released Prisoners	*Major Seely*	Read 1° 17th July (903)
*Sale of Butter	*Mr. Fellowes*	Bill withdrawn 20th July (1489)
Supreme Court of Judicature Ireland (No. 1)	*Mr. Atkinson*	Read 1° 19th July (1192)
Supreme Court of Judicacature Ireland (No. 2)	*Mr. Atkinson*	Read 1° 19th July (1193)
*Telegraph Construction	*Lord Stanley*	Bill withdrawn 19th July (1296)
Town Tenants (Ireland)	*Mr. Patrick O'Brien*	Report 18th July (1166)
Trade Unions	*Sir A. Hickman*	Bill withdrawn 19th July (1295)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1905.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

In Continuation of List given in preceding Volume.

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Prisons (Scotland),—Copy of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the Appointment of a Visiting Committee to the Prison at Glasgow (Duke Street) [40 and 41 Vic., c. 53, s. 58]	10 July	40 days
Board of Education (Building Regulations),—Copy of the Building Regulations, being principles to be observed in planning and fitting up new buildings for Public Elementary Schools, together with Rules as to construction and certain requirements as to plans [33 and 34 Vic., c. 75, s. 97].	12 July	One month
Shop Hours Act, 1904 (Closing Order—Borough of Darwen),—Copy of Order made by the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Darwen and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department fixing the hours of closing for Hairdressers' and Barbers' Shops within the Borough [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)].	14 July	40 days
Union of Benefices Act (Saint Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor and Saint Benet Fink),—Copy of Scheme under The Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting an Union of the Benefices of Saint Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor and St. Benet Fink) [23 and 24 Vic., c. 142, s. 15].	19 July	Two months
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1906 [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6].	20 July	40 days

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1905.

JULY 10—*JULY* 21.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Abbeyfeale

Land Purchase in, Information as to.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 17*, 889.

Abbeyleix

Gun Licence Case of J. Devoy, Decision in.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 20*, 1399. 1400

Aberdeen

Educational Trust Home, Date of opening, Applications for Admission, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 18*, 1068.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork County, N.E.]

Fermoy, Extension of Telephone Service to, proposed, *July 20*, 1401.

Tobacco Cultivation Experiments, Expenditure on, and Progress made with, *July 12*, 398.

Everard Estate, Result of Experiments on, *July 20*, 1396, 1397.

Wallis Estate—Application for Reinstatement of Mr. T. O'Keeffe, *July 10*, 92.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, Rhondda]

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 350, 354, 355, 358.

Rhondda Valley Mining Disaster, Proposals as to investigating, *July 12*, 413.

Accidents

Children run over in London Streets, Number of—Police Powers of preventing children from clinging to cars, etc.
Q. Mr. S. Smith; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 17*, 874, 875.

Covered Vans, caused by, Number of Prosecutions, etc.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 12*, 382.

Mines, in, *see under* Mines.

Accidents (Mines and Factories) Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read and discharged, and Bill withdrawn, *July 17*, 992.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hon. Sir A.—*Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury* [Somerset, Wellington]

Business of the House, Criticisms on Conduct of, *July 17*, 996.

Cabinet, Alleged Dissensions in, *July 17*, 996.

Unemployed Workmen Bill Possibility of Passing into Law this Session, *July 12*, 508.

Aden

Boundary between British Protectorate and Yemen, Demarcation of, Information as to.
Os. Lord Reay, *July 11*, 231; Marquess of Bath, 236, 237.

[*cont.*

Aden—*cont.*
  Harbour, Importance of Deepening—Recommendations of Commission, etc.
    Os. Lord Reay, *July 11*, 229, 230, 238, 239; Lord Brassey, 232, 233; Marquess of Bath, 233-236; Marquess of Ripon, 237, 238.
  Negotiations between Turkish Government and Arab Imam of Yemen, Information as to.
    Os. Lord Reay, *July 11*, 232.
  Railway Communication with the *Hinterland*—Recommendations of Commission.
    Os. Lord Reay, *July 11*, 230, 231; Marquess of Bath, 236.
  Report of Commission, Publication of, proposed.
    Os. Lord Reay, *July 11*, 231, 232, 238; Marquess of Bath, 235.
  Trade Statistics for 1902-5, Publication of, proposed.
    Os. Lord Reay, *July 11*, 231, 232, 238; Marquess of Bath, 235.

Adjournments of the House
  Holidays, Mr. A. J. Balfour's *Motion* as to – Date of making.
    Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 900, 901.

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company Bill
  Committee on.
    Members of, Voting on Second Reading, Appointment of Members financially interested, etc.
      Os. Mr. Lough, *July 11*, 271, 272; Mr. Halsey, 271, 272; Mr. Boulnois, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rutherford, Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell, 272.
    Nomination of—*Motion* (Mr. Remnant), *July 12*, 377.
    Power to Sit, while *Motion* against appointment was on Agenda.
      Os. Mr. Boulnois, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Lough, Mr. Remnant, *July 12*, 378.
  Passing into Law this Session, Possibility of.
    Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 18*, 1076, 1077.
  Purchases of Electrical Undertakings, Provision as to.
    Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. B. Law, *July 18*, 1065, 1066.

Admiralty
  First Lord—Earl of Cawdor.
  Financial Secretary—Mr. Pretyman.

Advertisements Regulation Bill
  c. 1R.* *July 17*, 902.

Africa, Central
  Barotse Kingdom, Boundary of—Award of King of Italy, Presented, *July 19*, 1171; *July 20*, 1298.

Africa, East
  Colonial Prisoners Removal Act, 1884, Order in Council applying, to Protectorate, Presented, *July 17*, 805, 850.
  Zionist Decision as to accepting or declining territory.
    Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 11*, 260.
    Tabling Papers, proposed.
      Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 13*, 549.

Africa, West
  Revenue and Expenditure—Returns Presented, *July 21*, 1500, 1517.

Agricultural Rates Act (1896, etc.) Continuance Bill
  l. 3R.* *July 11*, 220.

Agriculture, Board of
  President—Rt. Hon. A. E. Fellowes.

Agriculture.
  Poisons used in, Legislation to regulate Sale of.
    Qs. Mr. A. Cross; *As.* Mr. Fellowes, *July 13*, 552, 553.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
  Diseases of Animals Acts, Report of Proceedings under, Presented, *July 10*, 61; *July 11*, 216.
  Funds, Surplus, Allocation of, Claims of Ulster, &c.
    Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 88, 89.
  Officials, Names, Duties and Salaries of.
    Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 19*, 1173.
  Promotions, Inquiring into System of, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 75.
  Veterinary Branch Clerks, Salaries of.
    Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 886.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyll]
  Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1106, 1107, 1120.
    Importance of passing into Law this Session, *July 12*, 508.
  Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill, Proposals as to taking, *July 20*, 1406.
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 750, 751, 777.

Alcohol
  Manufacturing purposes, for—Regulations, proposals as to.
    Qs. Mr. E. Wason; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 19*, 1176, 1177.

Algiers
- British Consulate—Hours of business, Fees charged, Custom as to issue of Bills of Health to Shipping, &c.
  - *Q.* Mr. Runciman; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 18*, 1047.

Aliens
- Arrivals during 1904 as shown in Board of Trade Return.
  - *Q.* Mr. S. Samuel; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 17*, 881.
- Land, Acquisition of, by—Revival of old law prohibiting, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *July 20*, 1383.
- Passengers to places out of Europe, *see under* Emigration and Immigration—Number and Nationality of Passengers, &c.
- Paupers in England and Wales, Number of, and Cost of Relief to.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles, *July 17*, 879.
  - *Qs.* Mr. H. Samuel, Sir W. Tomlinson; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 878, 879.

Aliens Bill
- *c. Com.*, *July 10*, 110; *July 11*, 289.
- *Rep.*, *July 11*, 375.
- *Con. July 17*, 903; *July 18*, 1137.
- 3R., *July 19*, 1257.
- *l.* 1R.* *July 20*, 1299.
- *Debates in Committee, July 10*, 110; *July 11*, 289; *Consideration, July 17*, 903; *July 18*, 1137; *Third Reading, July 19*, 1257.
  - Asylum for Victims of Persecution, Retention of Principle of, 150–184, 943, 955, 973, 1261, 1262, 1271, 1281, 1282.
  - British-born Subjects naturalised in a foreign country, Application of the Act to, 343–358, 983–987.
  - Cabin Passengers, Examination of, proposed, 329–338.
  - Class of persons sought to be excluded, 1257.
  - Clause I, Omission of, proposed, 903, 904.
  - Contract workers, question as to Exclusion of, 131–139, 275, 921–938, 1269, 1280.
  - Criminals.
    - Expulsion of, Provisions as to, 1259, 1260, 1264, 1270.
    - Landing of, not interfered with by the Bill, 1259, 1260, 1264, 1270.
  - Deportation—Shipmasters' Liability for Deportation of Immigrant already admitted, 289–302, 1156–1158, 1257.
    - Expenses incurred by Secretary of State, Payment of, 307, 308.
    - Extending from six months to one year, proposed, 305–307.
  - Diseases introduced by Aliens, Regulations as to Medical Inspection, etc., 145–148.

Aliens Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates in Committee, etc.—cont.*
  - Examination of Immigrants.
    - Expenses of, to be defrayed by Shipowners, Proposals as to, 903–905, 910, 913, 1258.
    - Provision of Accommodation by Authorities entrusted with Administration of Act, proposed, 911–912.
    - Public Court, holding in, proposed, 912–915.
  - Exclusion.
    - Appeals against.
      - Hearing without Delay, 1138.
      - Notice of right of, to be given to Masters and Immigrants, 1139.
    - Class of persons aimed at by the Bill, 1257.
  - Expulsion or repatriation of Undesirables, Methods of dealing with Criminals, 1259, 1260, 1264, 1270.
    - Jewish Board of Guardians, Policy of, as to, 960, 961, 1283.
  - Government Amendments, 187, 188, 193, 194, 321, 322, 363, 364, 1161, 1287.
  - Immigrant already Rejected by, or Deported from, some other Country, Exclusion of, proposed, 149, 150, 977–980.
  - Immigration Boards.
    - Appeals from Decisions of, Hearing without Delay, proposed, 1138.
    - Constitution of, Qualifications of Members, Rate of Remuneration, etc., 987–991, 1138–1142.
    - Member of a *bona fide* Organisation of Workmen, Appointment of, proposed, 1145–1152.
  - Necessity for the Bill not Proved, alleged, 905, 906, 1262, 1264–1269, 1274, 1275, 1287.
  - Number of Undesirables likely to be Excluded, 274, 275, 278, 1263.
  - Overcrowding in the East End due to Aliens, alleged, 1266, 1267, 1270–1272.
  - Political Refugees, Exemption of, from Operations of the Bill—Difficulty of defining a "Political Refugee," 943–952, 973, 974, 1258, 1271.
  - Poor Law Relief given to Aliens, Statistics as to, 1261, 1272, 1273.
  - Poverty Test, Objections to, 1263, 1276, 1284, 1285.
    - "Decency."
      - Definition of, and means of Evading Restrictions of Sub-section (*a*), 925, 926.
      - Omission of word "Decently" from Sub-section (*a*), proposed, 123–131.

[*cont.*

Aliens Bill—*cont.*

Debates in Cmomittee, etc.—cont.

Poverty Test, Objections to—*cont.*

Exclusion of any Likely to become Chargeable to Poor Law Relief, 113-120, 1257, 1259.

Exemption of Persons claiming Support of Relatives, proposed, 919–921.

Protection, Stepping-stone to, alleged, 119, 133, 135, 931, 1262, 1263, 1271, 1278–1281.

Religious Persecution, Admission of Persons flying from, 150–184, 275, 955–970, 1258, 1271.

"Shop Window Bill," alleged, 1263, 1264, 1288.

Skilled Workmen not to come under heading "Undesirable," proposed, 142–144.

Standard of Living lowered by Aliens, allegations as to, 1273, 1274.

"Steerage Passenger," Definition of, 333–337.

Inclusion of Alien Seamen working a passage across, proposed, 339–343.

Unworkable Nature of the Measure, alleged, 1277, 1278.

Working Classes, Attitude of, towards the Bill, 925, 926, 1265, 1266, 1270, 1288.

Cabin and Steerage Passages from Continent, Difference in cost of.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel ; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 17*, 882.

Expenses.

Buildings for Accomodation and Examination of Aliens, Provision for—Payment by Shipowners, proposed.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *July 11*, 278 ; Mr. A. Douglas, 279 ; Mr. Galloway, 280 ; Mr. G. Whiteley, 282 ; Maj. E. Gordon, 283 ; Mr. Runicman, 284.

Committee to authorise Payment of, out of Moneys to be provided by Parliament—*Resolution* [Mr. A. Douglas], *July 10*, 204 ; Reported, *July 11*, 273.

Estimated Cost of Administering the Act.
Os. Mr. A. Douglas, *July 11*, 278, 285 ; Mr. Bryce, 279, 280 ; Mr. Bright, 280 ; Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. D. MacIver, 281 ; Mr. G. Whiteley, 282.

Aliens Bill—*cont.*

Expenses—*cont.*

Limiting to £10,000 or £24,000 annually, proposed.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *July 11*, 273, 274 ; Mr. Trevelyan, 274, 275 ; Mr. A. Taylor, 276 ; Mr. Bowles, 277 ; Mr. Lough, 277, 278 ; Mr. A. Douglas, 278 ; Mr. Coghill, 282, 283 ; Mr. Runciman, 284 ; Mr. Churchill, 286.

Ports.
Dover, Reason for not Including.
Qs. Mr. Runciman, Mr. Emmott ; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 17*, 875, 876.

Ireland, Immigration Ports in.
O. Capt. Donelan, *July 17*, 874.
Q. Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 17*, 874.

Shipping Companies, Provision for Protection of.
Q. Mr. C. Wilson ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 10*, 66, 67.

Allen, Mr. C. P. [Gloucester, Stroud]

Macedonia — Mürzsteg Programme — Exemption of burnt Christian Villages from one year's Taxation, *July 19*, 1172.

Volunteers.

Efficiency, Measures proposed for Attaining, *July 20*, 1368.
Inspection Period ordered by Circular Letter, Postponement of, *July 10*, 80.

Service Abroad, Fitness for, as a Test of Efficiency, *July 19*, 1174, 1175.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]

Clew Bay Islands, Disposal of Grazing Lands on, *July 10*, 74.

Derrycroff Bridge, Erection of, proposed, *July 20*, 1374.

O'Donell Estate — Progress of Negotiations for Sale of, *July 10*, 74.

Westport Floods—Cause and Prevention of, *July 13*, 538.

Andover Lighting and Power Bill
l. 3R.* *July 10*, 2.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*,* *July 14*, 734.

Anglo-French Convention.

Moroccan Trade, Provisions as to, *see under* Morocco.

Anson, Sir W. R.—*Secretary to the Board of Education* [Oxford University]

Grants—Quarterly Instalments, Decision as to continuing Payment in, *July 14*, 743.

Leicestershire Education Committee, Exclusion of Children under five years of age by—Increase of Amount of Grants for Infants, proposed, *July 17*, 863.

[*cont.*

Anson, Sir W. R.—*cont.*

- Log-book, Regulations as to removing, *July 20*, 1374.
- Merionethshire Grants, Payment of, *July 10*, 85.
- Teachers, Pupil—Grants earned by Attendance at Schools conducted for Private Profit, *July 10*, 70.
- Time Tables, Regulation as to Unavoidable Temporary Disturbance of, *July 17*, 863.
- Watford Grammar School—Proposals as to Addition of Girls' Department, *July 17*, 864.

Anthrax

- Devonshire Outbreak, Measures taken to cope with.
  Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 19*, 1178.

Arabia

- Aden, *see that title.*
- Yemen, Province of.
  - Boundary between British Protectorate of Aden and Yemen, Information as to Demarcation of.
    Os. Lord Reay, *July 11*, 232; Marquess of Bath, 236, 237.
  - Negotiations between Turkish Government and Arab Imam of Yemen, Information as to.
    Os. Lord Reay, *July 11*, 232.

Argentine Republic

- Trade Report Presented, *July 13*, 510.

Armagh

- Licensed Premises, Regulations as to Display of Flags on.
  Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 10*, 91, 92.

Armstrong Estate

- Untenanted Land, Disposal of.
  Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 17*, 857.

Army

- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
- *Under-Secretary*—Earl of Donoughmore.
- *Financial Secretary*—Mr. W. B. Davenport.
- Administration of.
  - Changes of Policy, Continual—Disastrous Effects of.
    Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 13*, 669, 670; Mr. Churchill, 675.
  - Responsibility of Minister to the House and the Country.
    Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 13*, 667, 668; Mr. Churchill, 675.

Army—*cont.*

- Artillery.
  - Garrison, Recruiting for, Satisfactory Condition of.
    Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 650, 651.
  - Re-armament of.
    Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 654; Mr. Churchill, 677.
- Bands—Regulations as to Pitch of Instruments.
  Q. Major Evans-Gordon; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 541.
- Bayonets, Allocation of Orders for.
  Qs. Mr. J. F. Hope; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 10*, 75; *July 18*, 1056.
- Bordon Camp—Drainage into River Wey, Measures taken to prevent Pollution, etc.
  Q. Col. W. Murray; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 10*, 76.
  Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 546, 547.
- Cavalry.
  - Officers.
    - Commissions, Number of, granted since the South African War.
      Os. Lord Heneage, Earl of Donoughmore, *July 18*, 1039.
    - Resignations and Retirements since the South African War, Number of.
      Os. Lord Heneage, Earl of Donoughmore, *July 18* 1039.
    - Shortage in, Proposals for dealing with.
      Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 654; Lord Heneage, Earl of Donoughmore, *July 18*, 1039, 1040.
      Q. Mr. Marks; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 255.
  - Organisation of, Satisfactory Condition of.
    O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 653, 654.
  - Saddles, Weight of, etc.
    O. Mr. Hunt, *July 13*, 680.
- Commander-in-Chief, Pay of, *see under* Roberts, Earl.
- Commands, Reorganisation of, Information as to.
  Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 17*, 833, 835, 836; Earl of Donoughmore, 833, 834; Lord Harris, 834.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Compulsory Military Service, *see that title.*

Condition of the Army not bettered since 1899, alleged.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 10*, 13–18, Earl of Donoughmore, 23; Marquess of Ripon, 44; Earl of Wemyss, 47; Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 652, 657; Mr. Buchanan, 666, 667; Mr. Churchill, 677.
Qs. Mr. Lambert; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 1187.

Courts-Martial Statutory limit for trials by—Powers of War Stores Commission, *see under* South African War Stores, etc.

Desertions, Diminution in Number of.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 651, 652; Mr. C. Warner, 664, 665.

Efficiency of, under New Scheme.

Standard of fitness, Measures taken to preserve, etc.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 10*, 76.

Statement as to, Date of making.
Os. Gen. Laurie, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 108.

Engineers, Royal, Proposals as to Reorganisation of.
Os. Mr. Arnold Forster, *July 13*, 656; Mr. Buchanan, 668.

Expenditure, Increase in.
O. Mr. Churchill, *July 13*, 676.

Feeding Arrangements, Improvement in.
O. Col. Kenyon-Slaney, *July 13*, 671.

Guard Rooms—Sleeping Accommodation, Improvements effected in.
Q. Mr. Colston; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 542.

Guards, Vacancies in.
Q. Mr. Marks; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 255.

Guns, New.

Cost of, to be defrayed by India, alleged
Os. Mr. C. Warner, Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 665.

Progress made with.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 655.

Gymnasia—Chief Inspector of, Length of Service of.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 17*, 866.

Home Service Battalions—Headquarters of Western Command—Reasons for substituting Exeter for Taunton.
O. Col. Welby, *July 13*, 674.

Improvement in *Personnel* and Organisation of the Army since 1903.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 653, 657, 658, 660; Col. Kenyon-Slaney, 671, 672.

Long Service Men available for Indian and Foreign Drafts.
Q. Mr. Marks; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 256.

Army—*cont.*

Manœuvres — Clonaslee Evicted Farm, Authority for Occupation of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 18*, 1052.

Medical Corps—War Honours, Custom as to Non-Award of.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 14*, 745.

Military Requirements for Defence at Home and Abroad.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 624, 625.

Militia, Volunteers, Yeomany, *see those titles.*

Mobilisation Arrangements, Information as to.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 17*, 833, 835, 836; Earl of Donoughmore, 833, 834; Lord Harris, 834.

Nine Years' Service—Effect of, on Recruiting.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 649, 650.

Non-Commissioned Officers, etc.—Plain-Clothes Regulations for.
Q. Mr. Colston; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 541, 542.

Officers.

Cavalry—*see under sub-heading* Cavalry.

Shortage in.
O. Mr. Hunt, *July 13*, 680.

Physical Standard, Regulations as to.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 626, 651.

Prisons—Proposals as to Improvements of Condition of Prisoners.
Qs. Mr. Bright; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 12*, 391.

Public Indifference towards Military Questions, alleged.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 10*, 14–18.

Recruiting and Enlistment.

Enlistments, April–June, from 1897 to 1905.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 12*, 384.

Nine Years' Service — Success of System.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 649, 650.

Re-organisation Proposals, Effect of, on.
Qs. Mr. Lambert, Mr. Marks; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 252–255.

Reforms—Department authorised to deal with.
Qs. Mr. Lambert; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 1187.

Re-organisation Proposals.
Os. Mr. C. Warner, *July 13*, 665.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
Reserve.
Satisfactory Condition of.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 657.
Short Service as a Source of Supply.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 662, 663.
Reserve Stores—Amount of, in Existence.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 656; Mr. Buchanan, 668.
Rifles, New.
Decision as to.
Q. Sir H. Seton-Karr; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 18*, 1053.
Defects of.
Os. Mr. Churchill, *July 13*, 678; Mr. Hunt, 680, 681.
Butler, Sir W., Report of Trial under, etc.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 20*, 1368.
Roberts, Earl, Pay of, as Commander-in-Chief, *see under* Roberts, Earl.
Shooting—Standard of efficiency; Measures taken to attain.
Qs. Mr. McCrae, Mr. F. Wilson; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster *July 13*, 546.
South African War, *see that title.*
Theatres, Regimental, Regulations for Management of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 12*, 385.
Three Years System, Failure of.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 649.
Training of Officers and Men, difficulty of carrying out Manœuvres, etc.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 10*, 16.
Uniforms—Plain Clothes Regulations for Non-commissioned Officers and Men.
Q. Mr. Colston; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 541, 542.
Vaccine Institute, Glycerinated Calf Lymph produced in, number of Calves operated on, means of disposal of Carcases, etc.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 18*, 1057.
War Honours, Custom as to awarding, in the various Branches of the Service.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 14*, 745.
War Office, *see that title.*

Army Council
Work of, Statement as to.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 646–649.

Army Estimates
Volunteer Corps, Capitation Grants, and Miscellaneous Charges of—£1,220,000, *Com.*, *July 13*, 579.
War Office and Army Accounts Department, Charge for—£545,000, *Com.*, *July 13*, 645.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O.—*Secretary of State for War* [Belfast W.]
Artillery.
Garrison, Recruiting for, satisfactory condition of, *July 13*, 650, 651.
Re-armanent of, *July 13*, 654.
Bands—Regulations as to pitch of Instruments, *July 13*, 541.
Bayonets, allocation of Orders for, *July 10*, 75; *July 18*, 1056.
Bordon Camp, drainage of—Measures taken to prevent pollution of River Wey, *July 10*, 76; *July 13*, 547.
Cavalry.
Officers, shortage in, proposals for dealing with, *July 11*, 255; *July 13*, 654.
Organisation of, satisfactory Condition of, *July 13*, 653, 654.
Compulsory Military Service, War Office attitude towards, *July 13*, 594, 660, 661.
Condition of—Lord Roberts' Statement, *July 13*, 652, 657.
Desertions, Diminution in Number of, *July 13*, 651, 652.
Efficiency of Army under new Scheme—Measures taken to preserve Standard of fitness, *July 10*, 76.
Engineers, Royal, proposals as to Reorganisation of, *July 13*, 656.
Guard Room sleeping accommodation, improvements effected in, *July 13*, 542.
Guards, vacancies for Officers in, *July 11*, 255.
Guns, New.
Cost of, proportion borne on the Estimates, *July 13*, 665.
Progress made with, *July 13*, 655.
Gymnasia—length of Service of Chief Inspector, *July 17*, 866.
Improvement in *Personnel* and Organisation of the Army since 1903, *July 13* 653, 657, 658, 660.
Kyles of Bute, War Office purchase of Land in, *July 18*, 1056, 1057.
Long Service Men available for Indian and Foreign Drafts, *July 11*, 256.
Manœuvres — Clonaslee evicted Farm, authority for Occupation of, *July 18*, 1052.
Military Requirements for Defence at Home and Abroad, *July 13*, 624, 625.
Militia.
Nucleus of Home Service Army, proposals as to, *July 13*, 662, 663.
Reorganisation Proposals, *July 11*, 252.
Non-Commissioned Officers, &c., Plain-clothes Regulations for, *July 13*, 542.
Physical Standard, Regulations as to, *July 13*, 626, 651.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O.—*cont.*

- Prisons—Proposals as to Improvement of Condition of Prisoners, *July 12*, 391.
- Recruiting and Enlistment.
  - Enlistments, April-June, from 1897 to 1905, *July 12*, 384.
  - Nine years Service—Success of System, *July 13*, 649, 650.
  - Reorganisation Proposals, Effect of, *July 11*, 252, 254.
- Reserve.
  - Satisfactory condition of, *July 13*, 657.
  - Short Service as a Source of Supply, *July 13* 662, 663.
- Reserve Stores—Amount of, in existence, *July 13*, 656.
- Rifles, new.
  - Decision as to, *July 18*, 1053.
  - Defects alleged in—Report of trial under Sir W. Butler, &c., *July 20*, 1368.
- Roberts, Earl—Pay of, as Commander-in-Chief—Opportunity for discussing in the House, &c., *July 12*, 386-389.
- Shooting — Standard of Efficiency — Measures taken to attain, *July 13*, 546.
- South African War.
  - Honours—Reason for refusal of, to Volunteer Medical Corps, *July 14*, 745.
  - Military Convicts, Sentences on—Case of T. Leonard, *July 10*, 81.
  - Press Censors, Salaries of, *July 19*, 1174.
- Theatres, Regimental — Regulations for Management of, *July 12*, 385.
- Three Years System, Failure of, *July 13*, 649.
- Vaccine Institute, Lymph produced in, Number of Calves operated on, Disposal of Carcasses, &c., *July 18*, 1057.
- Volunteers.
  - Active Foreign Service—Number of Battalions fit for, *July 10*, 78-80.
  - Ammunition Allowance per Man, *July 12*, 391.
    - Increase in, proposed, *July 13*, 604.
  - Camping Regulations, Relaxation of, proposed, *July 13*, 604, 633.
  - Camps—Expenses falling on Officers, question of Recouping *July 13*, 636, 637.
  - Capitation Grant, Proposed Changes in Incidence of, *July 13*, 635, 636.
  - Circular requesting Commanding Officers to report as to Efficiency of Units, &c., *July 13*, 627-629, 634, 635, 638.
    - Replies to, received, *July* 10, 79.

Arnold Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O.—*cont.*

- Volunteers—*cont.*
  - Disbandment of Battalions—Liability for legitimate Expenditure, *July 10*, 77.
  - Efficiency, Measures proposed for attaining, *July 20*, 1368.
  - Foreign Service, Fitness for, as a test of Efficiency, *July 19*, 1174, 1175.
    - Amended Circular, Terms of, *July 13*, 582, 627.
  - Inspection Period ordered by Circular Letter, Postponement of, *July 10*, 80.
  - Medical Examination, Provision for defraying Cost of, *July 12*, 390.
  - Physical and Dental Examination of, Army Council Resolution as to, *July 10*, 80, 81.
  - Reduction in Numbers of, in order to increase Efficiency, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 628–632, 639.
  - Romford Artillery, Reason for Non-supply of Modern Guns to, *July 13*, 543.
  - Shooting.
    - First-class Shot, Definition of, *July 10*, 79.
    - Standard of Efficiency, Measures taken to attain, &c., *July 13*, 543, 546.
  - War Office attitude towards, *July 13*, 623, 624, 631, 632.
- War Office.
  - Financial Branch.
    - Reorganisation of, *July 13*, 659, 660.
    - South African War, Employment during, *July 19*, 1175.
  - Staff appointments, Limit of Time for holding—Reason for extending appointment of Assistant Adjutant-General, *July 20*, 1375.
  - Work of, Hostile public criticism of, *July 13*, 647, 663, 664.
- Yeomanry—Reduction in number, Increased efficiency resulting from, *July 13*, 626, 657.

Arran, Earl of

- Land Act, 1903, Working of, Reason for alleged Failure, etc., *July 14*, 708.

Ashbourne, Lord—*Lord Chancellor of Ireland*

- County Courts (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 1304.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife, E.]

- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 180, 182; *July 11*, 297; *Con.*, *July 17*, 948, 949.
- Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1122.
- Defeat of the Government—Adjournment of the House till Monday, proposed, *July 20*, 1495.

Assam
  Coolie Labourers' Children, Facilities for education of.
    Q. Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 18*, 1052.

Assizes
  Winter—Orders in Council of 11 July, Presented, *July 17*, 805, 850.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N.W.]
  Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 141–144.
   3R., *July 19*, 1269–1272.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Londonderry, N.]
  Cork Assizes—Number of Jurymen challenged in case of J. Colbert, *July 20*, 1388.
  Evicted Tenants, Effect of New Regulations on Reinstatement of, *July 20*, 1473.
  Land Purchase.
    Advances to Tenants buying direct from Landlords, Power to add Advance to Purchase Annuity, *July 20*, 1468, 1469.
    Applications, Method of dealing with, *July 20*, 1470, 1471.
    Estate sold direct to Tenants, Powers of Commissioner to make Free Grant, *July 20*, 1468, 1469.
    Estates Commissioners.
      Legal Advice, Means of obtaining, *July 20*, 1467, 1468.
      Legal Questions referred to Judicial Commissioners by—Dissenting Commissioner to furnish Reasons for dissenting, *July 20*, 1473, 1474.
      Regulations—Power of Executive to interfere with discretion of Commissioners, *July 20*, 1469, 1470.
    Intimidation, Regulations dealing with, *July 20*, 1472, 1473.
    Town Holdings, Purchase of, Regulations as to, *July 20*, 1478.
    Untenanted land, Disposal of—Restrictions imposed by Regulations, alleged, *July 20*, 1471, 1472.
  Limerick—Money-lending case of Mr. Gaffee, decision in, etc., *July 20*, 1387.
  Roscommon Assizes—Result of Crown *v.* Reid case, *July 20*, 1388.

Attorney-General
  Sir R. B. Finlay.

Attorney-General for Ireland
  Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.

Autumn Session
  Meeting of the House for, proposed.
    Q. Mr. T. Chamberlayne ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 867.
    Q. Mr. Channing ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 901, 902.

Avoch
  Harbour Works, Date of Completion of.
    Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 12*, 379, 380.

Bailey, Mr. J. [Newington, Walworth]
  London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill—Withdrawal of objection to *Motion* for suspension of Standing Orders, proposed, *July 19*, 1170.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill
  l. 3R.* *July 17*, 802.

Balcarres, Lord—*Lord of the Treasury* [Lancashire, Chorley]
  Big Ben.
    Control of, *July 18*, 1067.
    Cost of Lighting, estimated Saving by use of Green Light, &c., *July 20*, 1386.
    Face of, Reason for using Green Light for, etc., *July 18*, 1066, 1067.
  Cornewall Monument in Westminster Abbey, Removal of—Tabling Drawings relative to, *July 19*, 1181.
  Edinburgh, King's Park—Reason for closing Upper Roads to motors, *July 13*, 535.
  Harcourt, Late Sir W., Proposals as to erection of Statue of, *July 18*, 1066.
  Hyde Park Carriage Drive, Refuse removed from, *July 17*, 882.
  Parks, Speed Regulations for Persons and Vehicles in, *July 11*, 265.
  Serpentine, Bridge over—Reason for Delay in Repairs, *July 20*, 1373.
  Walmer Castle, Information as to Sale of Furniture, etc., *July 12*, 383.
  Waygood & Co., Messrs., Refusal of, to employ Union Men, alleged, *July 14*, 742.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury* [Manchester, E.]
  Act of Union, Irish Parliamentary representation under, Basis of fixing, etc., *July 17*, 894, 895.
  Adjournment of the House for Holidays, Date of making *Motion* as to, *July 17*, 900, 901.
  Administrative County of London Electric Power Company Bill—Possiblility of passing into Law this Session, *July 18*, 1077.
  Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 130, 133, 134, 154–160, 177–182 ; *Con.*, *July 17*, 945–948, 964, 965, 968, 969 ; 3R., *July 19*, 1278–1286.
  Army.
    Efficiency of, under New Scheme, Date of making Statement as to, *July 10*, 108.

[con

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
- Army—*cont.*
  - Preparedness for War—Comparison with 1899-1900, *July 19*, 1187.
  - Reforms, Department authorised to deal with, *July 19*, 1187.
- Business of the House.
  - Course of, *July 17*, 899, 900; *July 18*, 1083, 1084; *July 19*, 1191, 1192; *July 20*, 1380, 1408.
  - Autumn Session, Meeting of the House for, proposed, *July 17*, 867, 902.
  - Measures which Government propose to proceed with, and Measures they propose to abandon, *July 10*, 102.
- Canada, Immigrants to, from Continent of Europe, alleged Payment to Shipping Companies for, *July 20*, 1377.
- Churches [Scotland] Bill, 2R., *July 12*, 449–458; *Com.*, *July 18*, 1104–1106; *July 19*, 1218–1223, 1245, 1250, 1251.
  - Date of proceeding with, *July 10*, 107, 108; *July 12*, 409, 410; *July 19*, 1192.
  - Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1094.
  - Progress, *Motion* to report, *July 21*, 1521, 1522.
- Coalfield in South Wales, Purchase of, by Foreign Syndicate, alleged, *July 12*, 414, 415.
- Colonial Conference, 1906, Subjects to be Discussed at, *July 10*, 99.
- Commerce, Minister of, *see subheading* Trade and Commerce.
- Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill, Proposals as to Taking, *July 20*, 1406, 1407.
- Contraband of War—Conference proposed by United States, Subjects to be discussed at, *July 13*, 569.
- Cotton, Gambling in, Proposals as to Prevention of, *July 20*, 1376.
- Customs Vote, Date of Taking, *July 10*, 99.
- Defeat of the Government in the Division Lobbies.
  - Business, course of—Adjournment of the House till Monday, proposed, *July 20*, 1495, 1496; *July 21*, 1521–1523.
  - Cordite Vote, Course followed by Liberal Government when defeated on, *July 20*, 1493, 1496; *July 21*, 1521, 1522.
  - Gladstone's Government of 1885, Procedure followed on defeat of, *July 21*, 1523.
  - Resignation, Statement as to, *July 20*, 1490–1496.
- Divisions, Time occupied by—Inquiry into Mechanical Methods of Recording Votes, proposed, *July 11*, 268–269.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
- East Ham refusal to administer Education Act—Government Proposals as to Legislation, *July 17*, 866.
- Education Rate—Proposals as to Relief of Necessitous Districts, *July 10*, 96.
- Education (Scotland) Bill.
  - Possibility of passing into Law this Session, *July 12*, 410.
  - Proposals as to Taking, *July 20*, 1407.
- Education Vote, Date of Taking, *July 12*, 385.
- Fiscal Policy.
  - Reform, Government Policy as to, *July 12*, 408.
  - Vote of Censure of Member for Berwick, day for Discussion of, *July 10*, 103–106; *July 19*, 1191.
- Gambling in Futures, Proposals as to International Measures to Prevent, *July 14*, 739–740.
- Ireland.
  - Act of Union.
    - Parliamentary Representation under, *July 18*, 1081.
    - Repeal of, proposed, *July 17*, 867.
  - Parliamentary Representation of
    - Act of Union, under, *July 18*, 1081.
    - Strength of, in 1832, 1842, and 1852, if calculated on a Population Basis, *July 13*, 544.
- Local Government Board and Board of Trade, proposals as to improving *status* of, *July 20*, 1403.
- Matheson Estate evictions, Legislation to deal with, proposed, *July 13*, 568.
- Members of Parliament, Prevention of Political Pressure on, by Civil Servants, *July 11*, 269.
- Militia Re-organisation Proposals, Opportunity for discussing, *July 11*, 267, 268.
- Motor Car Act, Inquiry into Working of, and Bill to amend, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 100.
- Municipal Corporations, Financial Position of—Inquiry proposed, *July 10*, 63.
- Naval Works Bill.
  - Date of Introduction of, *July 12*, 385; *July 13*, 543.
  - Discussion of, Opportunity for, *July 18*, 1085, 1086.
  - Schedule, Circulation of, *July 19*, 1204
- Navy.
  - Loans Bills, Abandonment of System of, *July 19*, 1204.
  - Submarines, Abolition of Use of, proposed, *July 13*, 544; *July 19*, 1186.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

- Public Accounts Committee Report, Opportunity for discussing, *July 10*, 100; *July 13*, 567, 568; *July 19*, 1192.
- Questions unanswered—Rule as to Circulation with the Votes, *July 11*, 270.
- Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas, *July 10*, 106, 107.
  - Anomalies of proposed scheme, *July 18*, 1082.
  - Boundary Commission.
    - Appointment, Constitution, and Terms of Reference, *July 18*, 1053; *July 20*, 1403–1406.
    - Precedents for Government course of action, &c., *July 18*, 1077–1080.
  - Explanatory Statement, Tabling, proposed, *July 10*, 99.
  - Ireland.
    - Effect on Act of Union, alleged Infringement of, &c., *July 12*, 404–406.
    - Down, South, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 1083.
    - Northcote, late Sir S., and late Marquess of Salisbury, Opinions of, in 1884, on Irish Representation, *July 19*, 1186.
  - King's Lynn, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 569.
  - Resolution.
    - Discussion of, Opportunity for, *July 12*, 407, 408.
    - Procedure in Taking, *July 17*, 898, 899.
  - Scotland—Kincardineshire, Effect of Proposals as to, *July 18*, 1082.
  - Wiltshire, Proposals as to, *July 17*, 893.
- Rhondda Valley Mining Disaster—Vote of Sympathy with Relatives of Victims, proposed, *July 12*, 414.
- Ritualistic Practices Commission Report, date of Presenting, *July 10*, 96.
- Roberts, Earl, Pay of—Opportunity for discussion in the House, *July 12*, 389.
- Sale of Butter Bill, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 98.
- Salisbury, late Marquess of, Memorial to, in Westminster Abbey—Objections to Removal of Cornewall Monument, *July 19*, 1194, 1195.
- Sewage Disposal Commission Report, Date of Issuing, *July 14*, 740.
- South African War Stores—Royal Commission of Inquiry.
  - Courts-Martial, Powers as to Trials by, *July 13*, 544.
  - Officers, Provision for Punishment of, if guilty, *July 18*, 1055, 1056.

Balfour Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

- Supply, Allocation of Time to, *July 18*, 1084; *July 19*, 1187–1190.
- Supply of Electricity Bill, Proposals as to Taking, *July 18*, 1077.
- Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to Taking, *July 19*, 1186.
- Trade and Commerce—Minister of Commerce, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 101; *July 20*, 1376, 1403.
- Trawling in Scotch Waters, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 17*, 868.
- Unemployed Workmen Bill.
  - Date of Taking, *July 10*, 97, 98.
  - Passing into Law this session, Possibility of, *July 12*, 411, 412; *July 13*, 570–573; *July 17*, 867.
  - Proposals as to Taking, *July 17*, 896; *July 20*, 1408.
- Volunteers—Opportunity for Discussion in the House, *July 10*, 102, 103.
- Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 101.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Leeds, Central]

- Education—Teachers' Salaries—Regulations as to Payments in Advance, *July 20*, 1370.
- Holborn Borough Council.
  - Clerk, Commission paid to, by Messrs. Bircham—Letter from Finance Committee, &c., *July 17*, 878.
  - Isaacs, Mr. L. H., Decision as to Proceedings against, *July 10*, 84; *July 19*, 1180, 1181.
- Hollesley Bay Labour Colony, Result of experiment as to, *July 17*, 877.
- Isolation Hospitals—Regulation as to Payment of Fees to Local Practitioner who is also a member of the Local Authority and who attends his own patients, *July 10*, 67.
- Labour Problem, Inquiry into—Proposals as to employing Services of Mr. R. Haggard, *July 17*, 877.
- Liverpool Dock Strike—Imported Labourers.
  - Quarters, alleged Insanitary Condition of, *July 12*, 381.
  - Smoking, Enforcement of Regulations as to, *July 12*, 380.
- Local Authorities' Accounts, Standardisation of—Proposals as to Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, *July 20*, 1381.
- Motor Car Acts, Working of—Proposals as to Inquiry, *July 10*, 83; *July 12*, 394.
  - Public Admission to Proceedings, &c., *July 17*, 878.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*cont.*

Motors.

Continental Rules and Regulations for, &c., Tabling Information as to, proposed, *July 17*, 865.

Licences for Drivers, printing Photographs of Holders on, proposed, *July 11*, 264.

Parks, Speed Regulations in, *July 11*, 265.

Speed Regulations — Penalty for breaches of Act—Essex County Council Resolution, *July 10*, 83.

Plural Voters in United Kingdom, Number of, *July 13*, 554.

Poor Law.

Alien Paupers in England and Wales, Number of, and Cost of Relief to, *July 17*, 879.

Midwifery Orders, Issue of, to Women unable to obtain services of Registered Midwife, proposed, *July 17*, 865.

Norwood Schools, Outbreak of Diphtheria in, *July 18*, 1046.

Poplar, Statistics as to Pauperism in, *July 13*, 534.

Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas.

Boundary Commissioners, Provision for Payment of, *July 17*, 881.

Constituencies of the United Kingdom, Return as to list and effect of Redistribution Proposals, &c., proposed, *July 17*, 856.

Merthyr Tydvil and Newport, Mon., Proposals as to, *July 12*, 382.

Population Limit Proposed, Effect of, *July 20*, 1382.

Amendment as to, proposed, *July 17*, 880.

Scotland—Govan, Proposals as to, *July 17*, 879.

Statement, Date of Tabling, *July 20*, 1382.

Surrey Education Committee, Auditor's Report on Accounts of, *July 10*, 68.

Thames Estuary, Pollution of, by Discharge of Crude Sewage from Whitstable and Faversham, *July 19*, 1179.

Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill, proposals as to, *July 13*, 534.

Tuberculosis (Bovine)—Date of presenting Committee Reports, *July 18*, 1045.

Unemployed, Work for—Powers of Poor Law Guardians under Act 42 Eliz. c. 2, &c., *July 19*, 1179, 1180.

Unemployed Workmen Bill, Proposals as to Taking, *July 17*, 877.

Vaccinators, Public, Fees paid to—Decision as to Adoption of Committee Recommendations, *July 17*, 855.

Vagrancy Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *July 10*, 63.

Workhouses—Nursing of Sick Poor, Adoption of Committee Recommendations as to, *July 20*, 1369.

Ballyphilip

Malicious Injury to Bull at, Efforts made to trace perpetrator of, &c.

Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 90.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [Camberwell, Peckham]

Navy—Repairs to Ships, Advantages of Government Yards over Private Yards, *July 12*, 480.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 18*, 1166.

Wei-hai-wei, Importance of, as a Naval Base, *July 12*, 480.

Bankruptcy

Report, Annual, presented, *July 20*, 1299, 1364.

Banogue

National School Arrangements, Authority for.

Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 396.

Barrymore Estate Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Bartley, Sir G. C. T. [Islington, N.]

Act of Union, Effect of, on Population of Ireland, *July 17*, 896.

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 334.

London Street Traffic Commission Report, Date of Issuing, *July 11*, 262.

Questions, Alterations in, at the Table—Rules as to communicating with Members, *July 13*, 557.

Bath, Marquess of—*Under Secretary for India.*

Aden.

Boundary between British Protectorate and Yemen, Demarcation of, *July 11*, 236, 237.

Harbour, deepening of—Recommendations of Commission, etc., *July 11*, 233–236.

Railway communication with the *Hinterland*—Recommendations of Commission, *July 11*, 236.

Trade Statistics for 1902–5, publication of, *July 11*, 235.

Army

Changes in organisation of, to be referred to a Mobilisation Committee, proposed, *July 17*, 806.

Departmental Secretary to the Government of India, granting local rank of Major-General to, *July 17*, 806.

Re-organisation Proposals of Lord Kitchener, Decision of H.M. Government as to, *July 17*, 805-807.

Council—Military Member, duties and *status* of—Decision of H.M. Government, *July 17*, 806.

Beaufort Castle
Shooting case.
Arrest of Messrs. J. and H. Phipps, etc. *Qs.* Mr. C. Wason, Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 13*, 562–563.
Date of Trial, information as to. *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 20*, 1386.

Belfast
Dundonald Cemetery.
Alteration of Resolution as to Allocation of Ground for Roman Catholic Burials. *Qs.* Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Long, Mr. Speaker, *July 18*, 1068, 1069.
Claim by Roman Catholics as to discretionary authority, etc. *Q.* Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1389, 1390.

Belgium
Diamond Industry of Antwerp—Report presented, *July 18*, 1019.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]
Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 922, 923.

Belper, Lord
Coal Mines (Weighing of Minerals) Bill, 2R., *July 13*, 512.

Benn, Mr. J. W. [Devonport]
Devonport Dockyard—Upholstery work allocated to women, *July 10*, 69.
Trade, Board of—Retention of Messrs. Bircham as Parliamentary Agents, *July 17*, 877.

Big Ben
Control of First Commissioner of Works, authority for. *Q.* Mr. Disraeli; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 18*, 1067.
Lighting of—estimated saving by use of green light, suggested addition of red light, etc. *Qs.* Col. Legge, Mr. J. F. Hope, Mr. Lough; *As.* Lord Balcarres, Mr. Speaker, *July 18*, 1066, 1067.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 20*, 1386.

Bills
Passing into law—Relative powers of Government and House. *O.* Mr. Speaker, *July 12*, 411, 412.

Bingham, Lord [Surrey, Chertsey]
Volunteers.
Camping regulations, relaxation of, *July 13*, 606.
Circular to Officers Commanding-in-Chief, *July 13*, 605.
Medical Examination—New Regulations, *July 13*, 605.
Reduction in number of, proposals as to, *July 13*, 606.

Births
Decline in rate—Statistics. *Os.* Bishop of Ripon, *July 20*, 1306, 1307.
Registration of, compelling earlier registration, proposed. *Os.* Lord Shuttleworth, *July 20*, 1329, 1330; Lord Kenyon, 1347; Earl of Crewe, 1349.
Report, Annual, with Supplements, Presented, *July 17*, 805, 851.
Still-births, registration of, legislation to effect, proposed. *Os.* Lord Shuttleworth, *July 20*, 1332; Lord Kenyon, 1345.

Black, Mr. A. W. [Banffshire]
Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1109, 1112, 1114, 1120, 1121, 1124, 1136.
Date of proceeding with, *July 10*, 107.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *com.*, *July 14*, 756, 764, 776, 791, 793, 795–797.
Instruction to Committee not moved on Second Reading by error from the Chair, possibility of moving, on Committee Stage, *July 14*, 745, 746.
Fiscal Policy of the Government, *July 12*, 408.
Plural Voters in United Kingdom, number of, *July 13*, 554.
Workhouses, Scotch, aged paupers in, during 1881, 1891, 1901 and 1904, *July 13*, 534.

Blackpool Improvement Bill
c *Rep.** *July 18*, 1041.

Blake, Albert, Case of
Compensation for Wrongful Imprisonment, proposed. *Q.* Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 19*, 1171, 1172.

Blennerhassett Estate
Reinstatement of W. O'Neill and B. Sheehy, proposals as to. *Qs.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1392.

Boland, Mr. J. [Kerry, S.]
Education.
Kindergarten, Regulations for Teaching and Training of Teachers, *July 12*, 395.
Rule 127 (*b*), Tabling Protest of Commissioners dissenting from, at meeting, *July 19*, 1184, 1185.
Rules, Procedure in Making and Revising, *July 19*, 1185.
School Building Plans, Date of issuing, *July 12*, 402; *July 20*, 1400.
Evicted Tenants, Delay in Re-instatement of, *July 20*, 1450–1452.
Fisheries—Motor Fishing-Boat, Experiments as to, proposed, *July 18*, 1068.

Boland, Mr. J.—*cont.*

Foreign Consuls in Ireland, *July 12*, 403.

Gortfada—Efforts made by Police to find Missing Sheep of Mr. O'Connor, *July 19*, 1172.

"Kew Bulletin," Reason for Discontinuing Publication of, Completion of Volume for 1901, &c., *July 11*, 245.

Libraries, Public, in Irish Rural Districts, *July 13*, 538.

Mayberry, F. G., Estate of—Progress of Negotiations for Sale, *July 10*, 88.

Sneem.

Dog Poisoning Cases, Measures taken to Trace Offenders, etc., *July 11*, 266.

Steamer Service — Decision as to Memorial from Residents in district, *July 19*, 1182.

Warden, Col., Reason for Police Protection of, *July 20*, 1388.

Trade Statistics, Instructions to Consuls as as to Collecting Irish Returns, &c., *July 10*, 82; *July 13*, 551.

Separate Statistics as to Trade between Ireland and Great Britain, proposed, *July 20*, 1401.

Bond Mr. E. [Nottingham, E.]

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 131; *Con.*, *July 17*, 967.

Bootle Corporation Bill

l. 3R.* *July 20*, 1297.

Bordon Camp

Drainage into River Wey, Measures taken to Prevent Pollution, etc.

Q. Col. W. Murray; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 10*, 76.

Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 546, 547.

Borneo, British North

Chinese Coolie Labour, Conditions of Employment of, on Tobacco Estates, etc.

Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Early Percy, *July 11*, 261, 262.

Company — Information as to Chinese Labour engaged by Coolie Contractor.

Qs. Mr. Weir, *As.* Earl Percy, *July 17*, 861; *July 19*, 1172; *July 20*, 1371.

Boulnois, Mr. E. [Marylebone, E.]

Adjournments of the House for Holidays—Date of making Mr. A. J. Balfour's Motion, *July 17*, 900, 901.

Administrative County of London Electric Power Company Bill, Committee on.

Acquainting Members of Appointment prior to Second Reading, *July 11*, 272.

Power to sit while Motion against Appointment was on Agenda, *July 12*, 378.

Bowles, Mr. T. G. [Lynn Regis]

Alien Paupers in England and Wales, Number of, *July 17*, 879.

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 115, 116, 145; *July 11*, 300, 308.

Expenses.

Buildings for Accommodation and Examination of Aliens, Payment of, by Shipowners, proposed, *July 11*, 278.

Limiting to £24,000 annually, proposed, *July 11*, 277.

King's Lynn, Population of, *July 13*, 569.

Land Acquisition by Aliens, Revival of Old Law prohibiting, proposed, *July 20*, 1383.

Morocco—Conference between France and Germany, etc., Tabling Correspondence as to, proposed, *July 17*, 873.

National Liabilities, Increase in, *July 19*, 1199, 1200.

Naval Works Bill, Expenditure under, *July 19*, 1198, 1199.

Navy—Loan Bills, Objections to System of, *July 19*, 1199–1200.

Post Office Expenditure proposed in Report of Public Accounts Committee, *July 20*, 1381.

Public Accounts Committee Report, opportunity for Discussing, *July 10*, 100, 101; *July 19*, 1192.

Questions, Rules as to Alterations in, at the Table, *July 13*, 557.

Re-distribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas—Procedure in taking Resolution, *July 17*, 897.

Roberts, Earl, Pay of, *July 12*, 389.

Supply, Allocation of Extra Days to, *July 18*, 1083; *July 19*, 1188, 1189.

Taxation of Food and Drink, Revenue derived from (1886–1905), *July 18*, 1049.

Transvaal War Contribution Loan, Payment of, *July 12*, 393.

Trincomali Naval and Military Station, Decision as to, *July 11*, 258.

Boyle

Disturbances at House of Mr. Magennis, Information as to, Arrests effected, etc.

Qs. Mr. Disraeli; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 18*, 1073, 1074.

Brassey, Lord

Aden Harbour, Importance of Deepening, *July 11*, 232, 233.

Canada, Direct Mail Service to, Utilisation of Naval Cruisers, etc., *July 17*, 809.

Navy.

Merchant Cruisers, Value of, as Auxiliaries in time of War, Policy of Subsidising, *July 17*, 807–812.

Reserve Forces, Organisation and Training of, *July 17*, 812.

Brazil
- Trade Report Presented, *July 14*, 686.

Brigg, Mr. J. [York, W.R., Keighley]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 763.

Bright, Mr. A. H. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
- Aliens Bill—Expenses—Estimated Cost of administering the Act, *July 11*, 280.
- Army Prisons—Proposals as to Improvement of Condition of Prisoners, *July 12*, 391.
- Navy Flogging Regulations, *July 11*, 257.
- Oswestry Sheep Market, Effect of Sheep-scab Regulations on trade of, *July 18*, 1044.
- Transvaal—Chinese Labour—Punishments, Authority for inflicting, etc., *July 13*, 548, 549.

Bristol
- Carnival Lottery, Action of Authorities as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Reddy; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *July 11*, 262, 263.

Bristol Blind Asylum Bill
- *c. Rep.* July 18*, 1042.

Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]
- Naval Works Bill, Date of Procuring Copies of, *July 19*, 1192.
- Navy—Submarines, Abolition of use of, proposed, *July 13*, 544; *July 19*, 1186.
- Unemployed Workmen Bill, Facilities for Passing, this Session, *July 13*, 573.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John—*Secretary of State for India* [Surrey, Guildford]
- Army.
  - Administration—Speech of Viceroy at Viceregal Council, *July 19*, 1176.
  - Changes in Organisation of, to be referred to a Mobilisation Committee, proposed, *July 17*, 872.
  - Departmental Secretary to the Government of India, Granting Local Rank of Major-General to, *July 17*, 872.
  - Reorganisation Proposals of Lord Kitchener, Decision of H.M. Government as to, *July 17*, 871–873.
- Assam—Coolie Labourers' Children, Facilities for Education of, *July 18*, 1052.
- Bengal, Partition of—Tabling Papers, proposed, *July 11*, 261.
- Calcutta, Government Acquisition of Land in, *July 18*, 1051.
- Council—Military Member, Duties and *status* of—Decision of H.M. Government, *July 17*, 872.
- Curzon, Lord, Reported Resignation of, *July 10*, 71.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John—*cont.*
- Education of Coolie Class.
  - Assam, Facilities for Labourers' Children in, *July 18*, 1052.
  - Reports as to, received, *July 11*, 250.
- Pannah, Raja of—Reason for Banishment, etc., *July 13*, 551.
- Press Censorship System, Information as to, *July 11*, 261.
- Railways—Loans for Construction, etc., *July 18*, 1163.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aberdeen, S.]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 345, 348, 349; *Con.*, *July 17*, 904–906.
  - Expenses — Estimated Cost of Administering the Act, *July 11*, 279, 280.
- Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1114, 1115, 1119, 1126, 1136; *July 19*, 1210-1220.
  - Date of Taking, *July 19*, 1192.
  - Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1096.
- Defeat of the Government—
  - Adjournment of the House till Monday, proposed, *July 20*, 1496; *July 21*, 1523.
  - Gladstone's Government of 1885, Procedure followed on Defeat of, *July 21*, 1523.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 752–755.
- Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas — Procedure in Appointing Boundary Commission, *July 18*, 1080.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R. [Perthshire, E.]
- Army.
  - Administration of.
    - Changes of Policy, Continual, Disastrous Effects of, *July 13*, 669, 670.
    - Responsibility of Minister to the House and the Country, *July 13*, 667, 668.
  - Condition of—Lord Roberts' Statement, *July 13*, 666, 667.
  - Engineers, Royal, Proposals as to Reorganisation of, *July 13*, 668.
- Reserve Stores, Reports as to, *July 13*, 668.
- Canada—Decision as to Garrisons at Halifax and Esquimault, Tabling Correspondence, etc., *July 20*, 1367.
- Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1101–1104, 1108.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 751, 752, 788, 789.
- Indian Army—Reorganisation Proposals, Decision of H.M. Government as to, *July 17*, 871.

[*cont.*

Buchanan, Mr. T. R.—*cont.*

Manufactures, Board of—Date of Introducing Bill to carry out Committee Recommendations, *July 12*, 394.

Naval Works Bill, Date of Introduction of, *July 12*, 385.

Navy—Rosyth Base, Estimated Expenditure on, *July 19*, 1202.

Roberts, Earl, Pay of, Opportunity for discussing in the House, etc., *July 12*, 386–390.

Supply, Allocation of Time to, *July 17*, 899; *July 19*, 1190.

War Office, Work of, Alleged Hostile Criticisms on, *July 13*, 667.

Yeomanry, Improved Efficiency of, *July 13*, 668, 669.

Buildings

By-laws as to, Committee of Inquiry into question of.
O. Lord Kenyon, *July 20*, 1343.

Bulgaria

Adrianople, Refugees in.
Q. Sir A. Hayter; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 13*, 535.

Buncrana

Telephone Area of Londonderry, Reason for not including in.
Q. Mr. Muldoon; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 20*, 1400.

Burghclere, Lord

Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 1303.

Epizootic Lymphangitis, Outbreak of, among Horses in Ireland, Measures taken to prevent incursion of, into England, *July 11*, 226; *July 17*, 837, 838.

Army Horses, Number affected, Progress made with stamping out Disease, etc, *July 11*, 228; *July 17*, 836–838,

Number of Horses imported from South Africa which were affected by the Disease, Return as to, proposed, *July 17*, 836, 839.

Origin of Civilian Outbreaks, Information as to, *July 17*, 844.

Burke, Mr. E. H. [King's County, Tullamore]

Bail—Security for Appearance of Man under his own Recognisance, *July 12*, 400.

Constabulary, R. I., Charges against—Treatment of Constables, etc., while on Bail, *July 17*, 886.

Judges' Charges to Juries, Accuracy of Newspaper Reports as to, *July 17*, 884.

King's County, Crimelessness of, alleged, *July 10*, 86.

Police, Metropolitan, Injuries caused to, while on duty — Compensation awarded, *July 13*, 558–560.

Burns, Mr. J. [Battersea]

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 181.

London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill — Withdrawal of objection to Motion to suspend Standing Orders, proposed, *July 19*, 1170.

Burntisland

Port of Registry for British Sea-fishing Boats, Order constituting, Presented, *July 17*, 805, 850.

Burt, Mr. T. [Morpeth]

Transvaal.

Chinese Labour.

Prisons, Number in, Nature of Offences, &c., *July 18*, 1059.

Punishments, Authority for Inflicting, *July 13*, 549.

Repatriations, Number and Causes of, *July 18*, 1059.

Mines—Prosecution of Europeans for Good Friday Labour in Jumpers Deep Mine, *July 11*, 259.

Burtonport

Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 12*, 384.

Business of the House

Autumn Session, Meeting of the House for, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. Chamberlayne; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 867.
Q. Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 901, 902.

Conduct of, Criticisms on.
Os. Mr. Churchill, *July 17*, 994–996; Sir A. Acland-Hood, 996.

Course of.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, *July 17*, 899, 900; Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. G. Bowles, Sir H. Fowler, *July 18*, 1083, 1084; Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 1191, 1192; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1380, 1408; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. K. Hardie, 1408.

Measures which Government propose to proceed with, and Measures they propose to abandon, Information as to.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 10*, 102; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 102.

Butcher, Mr. J. G. [York]

Aliens Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 987.

Civil Service Assistant Clerks (New Class), Salaries of, *July 17*, 859.

Buxton, Mr. S. C. [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
  Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 129, 176; *July 11*, 295, 356; *Con.*, *July 17*, 937, 966; *July 18*, 1152; 3R., *July 19*, 1265, 1268.
  Navy—Loans Bills, Objections to System of, *July 19*, 1205.
  Revenue and Expenditure — Estimated Expenditure on Capital Account during 1905–6, *July 14*, 743.
  Woolwich Dockyard Building Contract of Messrs. Playfair—Hours of Labour and Overtime of Men employed, *July 14*, 744.

Cabinet
  Dissensions in, Rumours as to.
    Os. Mr. Dalziel, *July 17*, 993; Sir A. Acland-Hood, 996.

Caithness
  Sea Fisheries, Report on, Presented, *July 10*, 3, 61.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanark, Mid.]
  Churches (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 12*, 463–468; *Com.*, *July 18*, 1123, 1126, 1130, 1131, 1132; *July 19*, 1233–1237.
    Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1095, 1096.
  Edinburgh—Sasine Office Fines and Deductions from Earnings of Clerks during last five years, *July 13*, 533.
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 759–762, 765–775, 789, 793, 794, 795, 798.
    Instruction to Committee not moved on Second Reading by error from the Chair, Possibility of moving on Committee Stage, *July 14*, 746.
  Fiscal Policy—Vote of Censure of Member for Berwick, Day for Discussion of, *July 10*, 106.
  Indian Railway Construction, Loans authorised for, *July 18*, 1162, 1163.
  Medical Act (1886) Amendment Bill, 3R., *July 18*, 1165.

Caledonian Canal
  Report Presented, *July 20*, 1364.

Caledonian Railway Bill
  *l. Rep.** *July 18*, 1017.

Camp
  Estate of Mr. Fitzgerald Day, Proposals for purchase of, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, etc.
    Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1366, 1367.

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. A. [Glasgow and Aberdeen]
  Churches (Scotland) Bill—Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1098.

Campbell, Mr. John [Armagh, S.]
  Watches as Gold or Silver Plate—Decision in case of Goldsmiths' Company *v.* W. Wyatt, *July 12*, 394.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]
  Adjournment of the House for Holidays—Date of making Mr. Balfour's *Motion*, *July 17*, 901.
  Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 357; 3R., *July 19*, 1276–1278.
  Business of the House.
    Course of, *July 17*, 899, 900; *July 20*, 1408.
    Measures which Government propose to proceed with, and Measures they propose to abandon, Information as to, *July 10*, 102.
  Churches (Scotland) Bill.
    Date of proceeding with, *July 10*, 108.
    Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1091, 1092.
    Progress, *Motion* to report, *July 21*, 1519, 1520.
    Proposals as to taking, *July 12*, 409.
  Coal Mines, Prevention of Disasters in—Opportunity for discussing in the House, *July 20*, 1380.
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 782–784.
  Fiscal Policy—Vote of Censure of Member for Berwick, Day for Discussion of, *July 10*, 102, 105; *July 19*, 1191.
  Government, Defeat of, in Division Lobbies.
    Business, Course of—Adjournment of the House till Monday, proposed, *July 20*, 1496; *July 21*, 1519–1521.
    Course followed by Liberal Government when defeated on the Cordite Vote, *July 21*, 1520, 1521.
    Resignation, Statement as to, *July 20*, 1489.
  Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas.
    Boundary Commission.
      Appointment of, Procedure as to, *July 18*, 1077–1080.
      Constitution of, *July 20*, 1406.
    Government Proposals, Information as to, *July 10*, 107.
    Resolution, Procedure in taking, *July 17*, 899.
  Roberts, Earl, pay of, Authority for continuing, etc., *July 12*, 387, 388.
  Supply, allocation of Time to, *July 19*, 1189.
  Transvaal—Treasury Loan to Mr. Van Rensburg—cabling for Information, etc., *July 11*, 259; *July 18*, 1058.
  Volunteers.
    Discussion in the House, opportunity for, *July 10*, 102.
    Reduction in Numbers of, proposals as to, *July 13*, 640, 641.

[*cont.*

Camperdown, Earl of
Russian Cruiser "Dnieper," seizure, etc., of British Vessel by, after the Battle of Tsu Shima, *July 13*, 524.

Canada
Cattle Exportation to United Kingdom, removal of Restrictions on, proposed.
Qs. Sir J. Leng, Sir G. Parker, Mr. Spear; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 12*, 391, 392.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 13*, 553.
Direct Mail Service to, importance of establishing — Government Subsidy proposed.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 17*, 809.
Garrisons at Halifax and Esquimault, decision as to, Tabling Correspondence, etc.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 20*, 1367.
Immigrants to, from the Continent of Europe, alleged Payment to Shipping Companies for.
O. Mr. C. Devlin, *July 20*, 1377.
Q. Mr. L. Jones; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1377.
Quebec—Tax imposed on Commercial Travellers and Agents for Firms outside Canada.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 17*, 862.
Wine from Cape Colony, Preferential Treatment for—similar preference in United Kingdom, proposed.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 17*, 859.

Canals (No. 2) Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read and discharged, and Bill withdrawn, *July 17*, 992.

Canterbury, Archbishop of
Convocations of the Clergy Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 719.

Cape Colony
Convict Labour System, Information as to.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 10*, 62.
Wine, Canadian Preferential Tariff for—Similar Preference in United Kingdom, proposed.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 17*, 859.

Carlisle, Borough of
Parliamentary Election — New Member sworn, *July 19*, 1173.

Carrington, Earl
London County Council (Tramways) Bill —Postponement of Second Reading for three months, proposed, *July 18*, 1007-1009.

Carts (Ireland) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 17*, 903.

Castlerea
Post Office—Postal Order signed in Irish by Mr. T. O'Heidhin, refusal to cash, etc.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 18*, 1076.

Castletown, Lord
Quit and Crown Rents, Ireland—Sums received for Redemption and Purchase since 1897—Return proposed, *July 20*, 1353.

Causton, Mr. R. K. [Southwark, W.]
Customs Watchers, decision as to Petition from, *July 19*, 1177.

Cavan
Evicted Tenants—Reinstatements effected, *Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 887.

Cavendish, Mr. V. C. W.—*Financial Secretary of the Treasury* [Derbyshire, W.]
Civil Service Assistant Clerks.
New Class, Salaries of, *July 17*, 859, 860; *July 21*, 1519.
Overtime, Payment of, *July 17*, 860, 861.
Salaries of, *July 12*, 384; *July 13*, 555.
Customs House Statistical Office, Promotions available to Clerks in, *July 18*, 1047.
Customs Watchers, decision as to Petition from, *July 19*, 1177.
Foreign Prison-made Goods—Increase in Amount excluded since last Statement, *July 21*, 1519.
Ireland.
Dublin.
College of Science Engineering School, proposals as to, *July 12*, 402.
Probate Court—"Clerk of the Seat," Duties, Salary, etc., of, *July 18*, 1075, 1076.
Education.
School Building Plans, date of issuing, *July 12*, 402; *July 20*, 1400.
Franciscan Manuscripts, Progress made with Printing, *July 11*, 250.
Gold Ornaments recently found in, *July 11*, 250.
Gun Licence Case of J. Devoy at Abbeyleix, *July 20*, 1400.
Treasure Trove, Publication in Wales of Laws as to, proposed, *July 18*, 1046.

Cecil, Lord H. R. H. [Greenwich]
Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 113, 114, 172-174, 180, 181; *Con.*, *July 17*, 950, 963, 964.
Town Tenants [Ireland] Bill, *Con.*, *July 18*, 1168.

Ceylon
Debt, Regulations as to Imprisonment for.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 17*, 858.
Education of Coolie Children, Date of presenting Committee Report on.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 20*, 1374.

Chairman
Aliens Bill.
Amendment defeated after 11 o'clock, any but Government Amendments precluded by, from being put, *July 10*, 182.
Clause already passed, Entering on again, out of order, 147.
Divisions—Delay of Opposition Members in proceeding to the Lobby, alleged, *July 11*, 326.
Irrelevant Observations, *July 10*, 118, 177; *July 11*, 341, 347.
Sub-section to be altered by an Amendment, Discussion of, as altered not in order till Amendment moved, *July 11*, 290.
Churches [Scotland] Bill—Irrelevant Observations, *July 18*, 1120; *July 19*, 1254.
Education [Scotland] Bill.
Irrelevant Observations, *July 14*, 777, 778, 785, 788.
Parish Areas Proposal, Opportunity for discussing, *July 14*, 752.
Minister for War making Speech while Leader of the Opposition in possession of the House, *July 13*, 640.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer*—[Worcestershire, E.]
Alcohol for manufacturing purposes—Proposals as to Regulations, *July 19*, 1176, 1177.
Chicory, Information as to, *July 19*, 1177.
Civil Servants' Wages—Proposals as to Parliamentary Advisory Committee, *July 13*, 555.
Excise Officers at Distilleries, Loss of Public Holidays by, *July 10*, 64.
Income Tax, Payment of, by Roman Catholic Clergy, *July 20*, 1399.
Ireland—Land Purchase, Funds available for, etc., *July 12*, 402.
Revenue and Expenditure — Capital Account, Estimated Expenditure on, during 1905-6, *July 14*, 743.
Taxation — Food and Drink, Revenue derived from (1886-1905) *July 18*, 1049.

Chamberlayne, Mr. T. [Southampton]
Autumn Session, Meeting of the House for, proposed, *July 17*, 867.
Southampton Telegraph Clerks, Decision as to increasing Pay of, *July 17*, 862.
Unemployed Workmen Bill, Proposals as to taking, *July 17*, 867.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Rt. Hon. J. Austen Chamberlain.

Channel Tunnel.
Construction of, Proposals as to proceeding with
Q. Lord E. Fitzmaurice; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 20*, 1335, 1386.

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northants, E.]
Autumn Session, Meeting of the House for, Proposed, *July 17*, 901.
Unemployed Workmen Bill, Proposals as to taking, *July 17*, 901.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *July 17*, 802.

Chatham.
Naval Dockyard at, Expenditure on Extension Works
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 19*, 1196; Mr. A. Lee, 1197.

Chelmsford, Lord
London County Council (Tramways) Bill—Postponement of Second Reading for Three Months, proposed, *July 18*, 1002-1005.

Chichester, Earl of
Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *July 10*, 1.

Chicory
Information as to.
Q. Mr. Lough: *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 19*, 1177.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.

Children
Accidents, Street, Number of, in London—Police Powers of preventing Children from clinging to Cars, etc.
Q. Mr. S. Smith; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 17*, 874, 875.
Employment of—Street trading by girls under sixteen, Bye-laws drafted by Local Authorities prohibiting.
Q. Mr. Tennant; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 13*, 560, 561.
Infant Mortality, *see that title.*
Juvenile Offenders, *see that title.*

[*cont.*

Children—*cont.*

Prevention of Cruelty to, Report of Society, Number of Prosecutions, Nature of Offences, Number of Deaths of Insured Children, etc.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 17*, 873, 874.

China.

Foochow—Trade Report Presented, *July 13*, 510.

Mackay Treaty, Disregard of, by Chinese Government, alleged.
Q. Mr. Moon; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 20*, 1371.

Trade Report Presented, *July 21*, 1500.

China Seas

Floating Mines in, Danger to Shipping from—Employing H.M. Ships to clear away Mines, proposed.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 10*, 49–53; Marquis of Linlithgow, 53.

China and Earthenware

Leadless Glaze Conforming to Rule 2, Number of Manufacturers using.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 17*, 854.

Churches

National Monuments in, Removal of, without Parliamentary Sanction, Introduction of Legislation to prevent.
Os. Sir E. Lees, *July 19*, 1193; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1194.

Churches (Scotland) Bill

c. 2R., *July 12*, 415.

Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1089.

Com. July 18, 1101; *July 19*, 1209; *July 21*, 1519.

Rep. July 21*, 1524.

Debates on Second Reading (Commons) *July 12*, 415; *Committee, July 18*, 1089, 1101; *July 19*, 1209.

Barrier Act, Terms of, 423, 424, 1236, 1237.

Church of Scotland.

Confession of Faith as set up by Act of 1693, 436, 457.

Ecclesiastical Courts of, Absolute Nature of Decisions of, 455.

Formula of Subscription, Power to modify, 415-420, 423, 435–438, 440–446, 448–458, 460–462, 466–468, 1089-1100, 1246–1251.

Amended Formula to be laid before both Houses of Parliament, with power to annul it, proposed, 1243-1254.

Consent of two-thirds of the Presbyteries, requiring, proposed, 1233–1240.

Churches (Scotland) Bill—*cont.*

Debates on Second Reading—cont.

Church of Scotland——*cont.*

Legislative Charter of, containe in Act of 1690 and not affecte by the Bill, 457.

Presbyteries, Constitution and Representation of, 1236–1240

Spiritual Independence of, 419, 424, 428, 444, 451, 452, 1246.

Clause 5, Postponement of Consideration of, 1133, 1134.

Congregational Property, Allocation of, 433–435, 446, 447, 463.

Dispute between Free Church and United Free Church—Effect of House of Lords Decision, 421, 422, 428, 429, 439, 458, 464, 466.

Division of, into two Bills—Instruction to Committee, 453, 1089–1100.

Executive Commission.

Constitution of, 460, 1103.

Money Compensation, Powers as to granting, 1110–1112.

Property, Allocation of.

Cases requiring special treatment, Powers as to, 1108, 1109.

Discretion as to, leaving unfettered, 1101–1108.

Disposal of Property or Endowments in event of Congregations falling below a certain number, Powers as to, 1124–1126.

"Interim Orders," Powers as to, 1122–1123.

Raising of Money by Bond on Property, Granting Powers as to, proposed, 1110–1112.

Trust Funds, Powers to administer, 421, 422, 446, 464.

Ferguson Bequests, Allocation of, 1128, 1129.

Free Church.

"Adequate Provision," meaning of the Term — Deletion of word "Adequate," proposed, 432, 433, 463, 1113, 1116, 1117, 1119, 1120.

Adherents — Proportion of one-third on Basis of Congregations of 1900, 1109, 1110.

Constitution, Power to Alter, 1127, 1128.

Education of Students, provision for, 1113, 1120.

Endowments—Taking into Consideration all sources of Income, proposed, 1113-1118, 1134, 1135.

Interdictions by, 430, 431.

[*cont.*

Churches (Scotland) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates on Second Reading—cont.*
  - Free Church—*cont.*
    - Ministers.
      - Aged and Infirm, provision for, 1113-1118.
      - Endowments for — Sources from which Contributions should be drawn, 1113–1118, 1134–1137.
      - Treatment of, by the United Free Church, 427.
      - Widows and Orphans of, provision for, 1113–1118.
    - "General Purposes," vagueness of Term — Addition of Words "Administration and Management," proposed, 1121, 1122.
    - Legacies under Testamentary Writings made before 30th October, 1900, allocation of, 1129–1133.
    - Power of the Legislature to reverse or nullify a final Decision of the Law Courts, 420–421, 425, 426, 439, 440.
    - Property, allocation of.
      - Cases requiring special Treatment, Powers as to, 1108, 1109.
      - Discretion of Commissioners as to, leaving unfettered, proposed, 1101–1108.
      - Disposal of Property or Endowments in event of Congregations falling below a certain Number, 1124–1126.
      - "Interim Orders," Powers of Commissioners to make, 1122.
      - Recording in Register of Sasines, proposed, 1123, 1124.
      - Settlement of Dispute, possibility of effecting, 423, 426, 459.
    - Royal Commission, Report and Findings of, 430.
    - Schedules, Terms of, 1133, 1134.
    - Theological Chairs in Scottish Universities, omission of Words requiring subscription to Confession of Faith by Persons appointed to, proposed, 1210–1232.
      - Presbyterian Churches, throwing open University Professorships to Members of, 1216–1221.
      - Recommendations of Royal Commission as to abolition of all religious Tests, 1212–1215, 1219–1221.
    - Union of all Presbyterian Bodies of Scotland under one National Church, possibility of, 454, 461.
  - Date of proceeding with.
    - *Os.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 107, 108; Mr. Black, 107; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. P. Smith, 108.

Churches (Scotland) Bill—*cont.*
- Government Amendments, placing on Notice Paper.
  - *Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 10*, 86.
- Importance of passing into Law this Session.
  - *O.* Mr. Ainsworth, *July 12*, 508.
- Progress, Motion to Report.
  - *Os.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 21*, 1519, 1520; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1521, 1522.
- Proposals as to taking.
  - *Qs.* Mr. C. Wason, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 12*, 408–410.
- Report Stage, Date of taking.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 1192.
- Tenure of Property by Free Church and United Free Church.
  - *Q.* Mr. E. Robertson; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 17*, 883.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S. [Oldham]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 119, 120; *July 11*, 292, 300, 353, 354; *Con.*, *July 17*, 990, 991; *July 18*, 1152.
  - Expenses, limiting, to £24,000 annually, proposed, *July 11*, 286.
- Army.
  - Administration — Continual Changes of Policy, disastrous Effects of, *July 13*, 675.
  - Artillery — Re-armament proposals, *July 13*, 677.
  - Condition of, *July 13*, 677.
  - Expenditure, increase in, *July 13*, 676.
  - Rifle, new, Defects of, *July 13*, 678.
- Business of the House, Conduct of—Criticism of Prime Minister, *July 17*, 994–996.
- Militia, Condition of, *July 13*, 678.
- Volunteers, Reduction in Numbers of, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 621, 622, 678.

Cigarettes
- Smoking among Juveniles, Legislation to prevent, proposed.
  - *Os.* Earl of Meath, *July 20*, 1325, 1326.

Civil Service
- Assistant Clerks.
  - New Class, Salaries of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Butcher; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 17*, 859.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 17*, 860; *July 21*, 1519.
  - Overtime, Payment for.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 17*, 859, 860.
    - *Q.* Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 17*, 860, 861.

[*cont.*

Civil Service—*cont.*
  Assistant Clerks—*cont.*
    Salaries of.
      Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 12*, 383, 384.
      Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 13*, 555.
  Political Pressure on Members by Civil Servants, Proposals for Prevention of.
    Q. Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 269.
  Retirements — Retention of certain Civil Servants over age of sixty-five — Treasury Minute and Return ordered, *July 18*, 1043; Presented, *July 20*, 1364.
  Wages, Parliamentary Advisory Committee's Proposals as to.
    Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 13*, 554, 555.

Civil Service Estimates
  Additional Expenditure in Relief of Distress in Ireland—Presented *July 12*, 379.
  Ireland—Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses of Office of, £83,415, *Com.*, *July 20*, 1409, 1459.

Civil Services and Revenue Departments (Excesses) 1903-4.
  Statement as to Sum required to make good excess on Grant for Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, Presented *July 20*, 1364.

Clancy, Mr. J. J. [Dublin Co., N.]
  Education of Afflicted Children, Source of Grant for, *July 20*, 1399.
  Land Purchase.
    Applications, Method of dealing with, *July 20*, 1475.
    Estates Commissioners, Regulations issued to, *July 20*, 1474.
    Intimidation, New Regulations dealing with, *July 20*, 1475.
    Town Holdings, Purchase of, Power of Commissioners to sanction, *July 20*, 1476.
    Vendors of Estates—Two-thirds of Purchase Money to be taken in Stock—Landlords consulted by the Chief Secretary, *July 20*, 1477, 1478.
  Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1168.

Clew Bay.
  Grazing Lands on Islands, Disposal of.
    Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 10*, 74.

Clonaslee.
  Evicted Farm, Military Occupation of, during Manœuvres, Authority for, &c.
    Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 18*, 1052.

Clonbrock, Lord
  Land Act 1903, Working of, Reason for alleged Failure, &c., *July 14*, 702.

Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Coal
  Irish, Transit Rates for.
    Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 17*, 858.
  Rhenish Westphalian Mines, Export Bounties paid by.
    Q. Sir T. Wrightson; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 18*, 1048.
  Welsh Coalfield, Purchase of, by German Syndicate, alleged.
    Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *July 20*, 1383; Mr. Markham, 1384.
    Qs. Mr. Llewellyn, Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 12*, 414, 415.
    Q. Sir L. Knowles; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 18*, 1054.
    Qs. Sir H. Vincent, Col. Lucas, Sir L. Knowles, Mr. Dalziel; *As.* Mr. B. Law, Mr. Pretyman, *July 20*, 1382-1384.

Coal Mines
  Disasters in.
    Provision of Special Apparatus for Rescue Parties, &c.
      Qs. Mr. T. Richards, Mr. Jno. Wilson; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 20*, 1378, 1379.
    Wattstown, at—Inquiry, proposed—Opportunity for discussing matter in the House, &c.
      Qs. Mr. T. Richards, Mr. K. Hardie, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir A. Thomas; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1378-1380.

Coal Mines (Weighing of Minerals) Bill
  l. 2R., *July 13*, 511.
  *Com.** *July 18*, 1020.

Coalisland
  Disturbance at House of Mr. Harkin, Efforts made to trace Offenders, &c.
    Qs. Mr. Doogan, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. W. Long, *July 20*, 1391.
  Mc Manus, J., Reason for summoning.
    Q. Mr. Doogan; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 20*, 1390.

Coastguard Service
  Expenditure on, Estimate for.
    Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 19*, 1196; Mr. A. Lee, 1197, 1198.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H.—*Under-Secretary, Home Office* [Ayrshire, N.]
  Bristol Carnival Lottery, Action of Authorities as to, *July 11*, 263.
  Hazelgrove Disturbances, Information as to, *July 11*, 263, 264.
  Rhondda Valley Mining Disaster, Proposals as to investigating, *July 12*, 413.

Coghill, Mr. D. H. [Stoke-upon-Trent]

Aliens Bill—Limiting Expenses to £24,000 annually, proposed, *July 11*, 282, 283.

Land Act (Ireland), 1903, Failure of, to settle the Land Question, *July 20*, 1454, 1455.

Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas, alleged Infringement of Act of Union, etc., *July 12*, 404.

Cohen, Mr. B. L. [Islington, E.]

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 161; *Con.*, *July 17*, 967.

Local Authorities' Accounts, Standardisation of—Proposals as to appointment of Committee of Inquiry, *July 20*, 1381.

Thames Estuary, Pollution of, by Discharge of Crude Sewage from Whitstable and Faversham, *July 19*, 1179.

Transvaal Mines, White and Coloured Labour employed in, *July 13*, 540.

Coleridge, Lord

Convocations of the Clergy Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 723, 724.

Transvaal—Chinese Labour—Flogging Regulations, alleged violation of, *July 20*, 1356.

Colonial Conference, 1906

Subjects for discussion at.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 99.

Colonial Office.

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. A. Lyttelton.

Colonial Prisoners Removal Act, 1884

Africa, East, Protectorate, Order in Council applying Act to, Presented, *July 17*, 805, 850.

Colston, Mr. C. E. H. A. [Gloucester, Thornbury]

Army.

Guard Room Sleeping Accommodation, Improvements effected in, *July 13*, 542.

Non-Commissioned Officers, etc., Plain-clothes Regulations for, *July 13*, 541.

Commerce

See Trade and Commerce.

Committees

Police and Sanitary Committee Special Report Presented, *July 19*, 1192.

Companies

Dublin Joint Stock, *see under* Dublin.

Joint Stock—Number registered during 1904 and since 1862, Number dissolved or struck off the Register (1904), amount of Capital, Fees, and Capital Duty Paid, etc.—Return ordered, *July 14*, 736; Presented, *July 17*, 850.

Companies (Winding-up) Act

Report, Annual, presented, *July 18*, 1019, 1043.

Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill

l. 2R., *July 20*, 1300.

Compulsory Military Service

Attitude of the Country towards.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 13*, 619.

Canadian Government proposals.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 13*, 619.

War Office Attitude towards.
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *July 13*, 593, 594; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 594, 660, 661; Maj. E. Gordon, 614.

Congested Districts (Scotland)

See under Scotland.

Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill

Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 11*, 266.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Mr. Ainsworth; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1406, 1407.

Connaught

Land Act, Failure of, in, alleged.
Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14*, 689, 698; Lord Oranmore and Browne, 707; Marquess of Londonderry, 715.

Conscription

See Compulsory Military Service.

Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill.

l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Explanatory Memorandum Presented, *July 10*, 62.

Constabulary, Royal Irish

Cryan, Constable.

Retention of, as a Peace Officer, Payment of Costs, etc., against.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 400.

Trial of, Tabling Judge's Notes, etc., taken in, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Muldoon, Mr. MacNeill: *As.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1393.

Dunphy, Sergeant, and Constable Daly, Charges against, at Gurteen Petty Sessions, present employment of Defendants, etc.
Qs. Mr. Reddy; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 13*, 566, 567.

Finnigan, Constable, Reason for Transfer of, to Longford.
Q. Mr. Doogan; *A.* Mr. Long *July 20*, 1390.

[*cont.*

Constabulary, Royal Irish—*cont.*
Masterson, Constable, Charges against, in Carroll case, Warrant for Arrest, etc.
  Absconding before Assizes.
    Qs. Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 93, 94.
    Qs. Mr. Delany, Mr. H. Burke, Mr. C. Devlin, Mr. Sheehy; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 885–886.
  Date of Disappearance, etc.
    Qs. Mr. Delany, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Cullinan, Mr. H. Burke; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 399, 400.
  Payment of Costs, etc., given against.
    Qs. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 400.
  Trial, Tabling Judge's Notes, etc., taken in, proposed.
    Qs. Mr. Muldoon, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1393.
Truncheon, Instructions as to use of.
  Qs. Mr. Muldoon, Mr. C. Devlin, Mr. Cullinan; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 883, 884.
  Q. Mr. Muldoon; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1392, 1393.

Contraband of War
Conference proposed by United States, Subjects to be included in.
  Qs. Mr. E. Robertson; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 569.

Convocations of the Clergy Bill
l. 2R., *July 14*, 719.

Debate on Second Reading (Lords) *July 14*, 719.
  Canterbury Convocation, Alteration in Constitution of, proposed, 720–731.
  Division negatived, and Debate adjourned *sine die*, 732.
  Meeting of Northern and Southern Convocations, Proposals as to, 720, 723, 724, 726.
  Necessity for the Bill, 719, 721, 728, 729.
  New Law on Convocation indirectly affecting the Laity, Objections to, 722–724, 729.
  Objects of the Bill, 719.
  Resolution of Convocation approved by the King in Council to be binding as Act of Parliament, Objections to, 722, 723, 725–727, 730.
  Right of Parliament to regulate Constitutional Powers or action of Convocation, 730, 731.

Cookstown
Telephone Extension to, proposed.
  Qs. Mr. Doogan, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Lord Stanley, *July 17*, 891, 892.

Corbett, Mr. A. C. [Glasgow, Tradeston]
Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1113.

Corbett Estate Bill
c. 2R.* *July 12*, 377.
  *Rep.** *July 18*, 1042.

Cork
Assizes—Number of Jurymen challenged in case of J. Colbert.
  Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 20*, 1388.
Criminal Statistics in—Condition of Country as to Cases of Intimidation, etc.
  Qs. Mr. Flynn, Mr. J. Devlin; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 19*, 1183, 1184.

Cork and Orrery, Earl
Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *July 11*, 213.

Cornewell, Capt., Monument to
See under Westminster Abbey.

Cornwall, Duchy of
Lord Warden—Earl of Ducie.

Corporal Punishment Restriction Bill
c. 1R.* *July 10*, 110.

Costa Rica
Trade Report Presented, *July 21*, 1500.

Cotton
Gambling in, Proposals for Prevention of.
  Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1375, 1376.
  International Repressive Measures, Proposals as to Introduction of,
    Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 14*, 739, 740.

County Courts (Ireland) Bill
l. 1R.* *July 14*, 686.
  2R. *July 20*, 1304.

"County of Anglesey," s.s.
Accident to, through Shifting of Ballast—Result of Inquiry.
  Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 21*, 1504, 1505.

County of London Electric Supply Company Bill
*c. Rep.** *July 19*, 1169.

County of Middlesex Light Railway (Extension of Time) Order, 1905
Presented *July 14*, 686, 735.

Cragg and Ardcrone Farms
Acquisition and Disposal of.
  Qs. Mr. Murphy, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 18*, 1072, 1073.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department Funds, Surplus, Allocation of, Ulster Claims, etc., *July 10*, 88, 89.

Ballyphilip, Malicious Injury to Bull at, Efforts made to Trace Perpetrators of, etc., *July 10*, 90.

Education—National School Teachers—Political Discussion at Meetings, Tabling Circular as to, etc., proposed, *July 10*, 89.

Irish Language, Expenditure on Teaching, in Schools (1902–1904), *July 10*, 89.

Lambeg Vacancy, Appointment of Sligo Postman to, *July 17*, 856.

Magistrates—Appointment of Mr. Kelly, Action of Lord Chancellor as to speeches made some time previous to election, etc., *July 10*, 90, 91.

Craig, Mr. R. H. [Lanarkshire, Govan]

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 763.

Govan, Proposals as to, under Redistribution Scheme, *July 17*, 879.

Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 138 ; *Con.*, *July 17*, 927–929 ; *July 18*, 1145, 1146 ; 3R., *July 19*, 1264.

Unemployed Workmen Bill, Proposals as to taking, *July 17*, 867.

Crete

British and Foreign Troops in, Information as to.

Q. Mr. Lambert ; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 11*, 249.

Crewe, Earl of

Births, Compelling Earlier Registration of, proposed, *July 20*, 1349.

Macedonia, Condition of, Progress made with Reform Schemes, etc., *July 18*, 1026–1028, 1038.

Physical Deterioration.

Anthropometric Survey to collect *data* as to, Institution of, proposed, *July 20*, 1348.

Recommendations of Committee, Carrying out, proposed, *July 20*, 1347–1350.

Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Lancashire, Stretford]

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 152–154, 180–181 ; *Con.*, *July 17*, 950.

Churches (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 12*, 418–423.

Croker Estate

Purchase negotiations, Re-instatement application of Mr. M. Power, etc.

Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 396, 397.

Crombie, Mr. J. W. [Kincardineshire.]

Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1230.

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 756.

Kincardineshire, Effect of Redistribution proposals as to, *July 18*, 1082.

Members of Parliament, Prevention of Political Pressure on, by Civil Servants, *July 11*, 269.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]

Aliens Bill, *Con.*, *July 18*, 1150.

Juvenile Offenders, Regulations as to Detention of, while awaiting trial, *July 20*, 1369.

Post Office Staff, Number of Males and Females on, *July 18*, 1044.

Unemployed Workmen's Bill, proposals as to taking, *July 12*, 411, 412.

Facilities for passing this Session, *July 13*, 572, 573.

Cross, Mr. A. [Glasgow, Camlachie]

Poisons used for Agricultural purposes, Legislation to Regulate Sale of, *July 13*, 552, 553.

Crown Agents for the Colonies

Accounts, Audit of—Minute authorising Extension, Presented, *July 13*, 511, 532.

Crown Lands Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read and discharged, and Bill Withdrawn, *July 17*, 992.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]

Constabulary, R.I.

Masterson, Constable, Charges against, Date of Disappearance, etc., *July 12*, 400.

Truncheon, Instructions as to use of, *July 17*, 884.

Sale of Butter Bill, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 98.

Customs and Excise

Customs Vote, Date of taking.

Q. Mr. E. Gray ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 99.

Duties—Allocation of Irish Share.

Q. Mr. J. Devlin ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 19*, 1173.

Excise Officers at Distilleries, Loss of Public Holidays by.

Q. Mr. J. Devlin ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 10*, 64.

Statistical Office of Custom House, Promotions available to Clerks in.

Q. Mr. J. Howard ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 18*, 1047.

Watchers, Decision as to Petition from.

Qs. Mr. Causton ; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 19*, 1177.

Dalkeith, Earl of
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com., July 14*, 752.
- Navy.
  - Dockyards--Increase in Salaries and Decrease in Wages, Reasons for, *July 12*, 475.
  - Repairs—System of Nucleus Crews, Effect of, on Repairing Work, *July 12*, 475.
  - Submarines, Accidents to, Steps taken to prevent Recurrence of, *July 12*, 476.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
- Aliens Bill, *Con., July 17*, 913-916, 920, 934, 935, 987.
- Business of the House, Course of, *July 18*, 1083.
- Cabinet Dissensions, Rumours as to, *July 17*, 993.
- Churches (Scotland) Bill—Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1089, 1090, 1091, 1095.
- Coalfields on Whitworth Estate, alleged Purchase of, by German Syndicate, *July 20*, 1384.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com., July 14*, 778, 779, 785, 798.
- Lord Chancellor, Rumoured Resignation of, *July 17*, 993, 994.
- Naval Works Bill, Opportunity for Discussion of, *July 18*, 1085.
- Navy Dockyards.
  - Deputations from Workmen, Practice of Admiralty as to Receiving, *July 12*, 491.
  - Discharges from, Information as to, *July 12*, 491.
  - Salaries, Increase in, and Decrease in Wages, Reasons for, *July 12*, 491.
- Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas—Boundary Commission.
  - Appointment of, Procedure as to, *July 18*, 1080.
  - Terms of Reference of, *July 20*, 1405.
- Roberts, Earl, Pay of, Opportunity for Discussing, in the House, etc., *July 12*, 387-389.
- Supply, Allocation of Time to, *July 19*, 1187, 1188.
- Transvaal Treasury Loan to Mr. Van Rensburg — Identity of Mr. Van Rensburg, *July 18*, 1059.

Darwen
- Shop Hours for Hairdressers and Barbers — Borough Council Order Presented, *July 14*, 686, 736.

Davenport, Mr. W. B.—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Cheshire, Macclesfield]
- Dockyard at Woolwich—Building Contract of Messrs. Playfair—Hours of Labour and Overtime Pay of Men Employed, *July 14*, 744.
- Trincomali Naval and Military Station, Decision as to, *July 11*, 258.
- Volunteers.
  - Conference between Officers and War Office—Arrangements as to Selection of Officers, *July 17*, 870.
  - Medical Examination, Provision for defraying Cost of, *July 17*, 871.
  - Reductions, Proposals as to, *July 17*, 870.
  - Shooting, Standard of Efficiency for, *July 17*, 870.

Deal
- Naval Barrack Theatre, Regulations as to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. A. Lee, *July 13*, 545.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 20*, 1376.

Deaths
- Report, Annual, with Supplements, Presented, *July 17*, 805, 851.

Defence of the Empire
- Dissemination of News in Time of War, Government Control over—Japanese Laws, etc.
  - *Os.* Lord Ellenborough, *July 13*, 512-518; Marquess of Linlithgow, 518.
- Home Defence.
  - Harbours, Objections to Placing Defence of, in hands of Naval Officers.
    - *Os.* Lord Muskerry, *July 10*, 35, 36.
  - Invasion, Possibilities of.
    - *Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *July 10*, 4–10; Lord Ellenborough, 19–23; Earl of Donoughmore, 24–27; Vis. Goschen, 27–29; Lord Newton, 33, 34; Marquess of Lansdowne, 39–43.
    - Former Invasions.
      - *Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *July 10*, 5, 6.
    - Hypothetical Cases.
      - *Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *July 10*, 6; Lord Ellenborough, 19–23.
    - Norfolk Commission, Report of.
      - *Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *July 10*, 6, 7; Earl of Donoughmore, 25.
    - Wolseley, Lord, Opinion of.
      - *Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *July 10*, 8; Earl of Donoughmore, 25.

[*cont.*

Defence of the Empire—*cont.*
  Home Defence.—*cont.*
    Navy as sole means of, Supplementing, by Increased Land Defences, proposed.
      Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 10*, 4, 10–13, 48, 49; Lord Ellenborough, 19, 22; Earl of Donoughmore, 23, 24; Vis. Goschen, 27, 28; Lord Newton, 33, 35; Marquess of Lansdowne, 36–40, 42, 43; Marquess of Ripon, 44–47.
    Raids, Possibility of—Strengthening Land Defences, proposed.
      Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 10*, 10–13; Vis. Goschen, 30–32; Marquess of Lansdowne, 41, 42.
    Short Service Army as Home Service Army.
      Os. Marquess of Ripon, Earl of Donoughmore, *July 10*, 46.
    Volunteers, Value of.
      Os. Vis. Goschen, *July 10*, 29, 30.
  Military Requirements at home and abroad, Importance of Ascertaining.
    Os. Earl Roberts, *July 10*, 13–18; Earl of Donoughmore, 23; Lord Newton, 34, 35; Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 624, 625.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory.]
  Abbeyleix—Gun Licence Case of J. Devoy, *July 20*, 1399.
  Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department.
    Promotion System, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 10*, 75.
    Veterinary Branch Clerks, Salaries of, *July 17*, 886.
  Clonaslee Evicted Farm, Authority for Occupation of, during manœuvres, *July 18*, 1052.
  Constabulary, R. I.
    Cryan, Constable, Information as to, *July 12*, 400.
    Masterson, Constable, Charges against, Date of Disappearance, Measures taken for Arrest, etc., *July 10*, 93, 94; *July 12*, 399; *July 17*, 885, 886.
  Dublin Metropolitan Police Station—Sergeants, Wearing of Number on Collar by, proposed, *July 17*, 866.
  Dunnes Minors Estates—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenant Talbot, *July 18*, 1069, 1070.
  Luggacurran Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of—Case of Mr. Byrne, etc., *July 18*, 1070, 1071.
  McFarlane Estate, Sale of—Number of years purchase paid, *July 20*, 1395.
  Post Office Wages, Political Pressure by Staff to obtain Increase of—Postmaster General's statement, *July 18*, 1063.
  Sandes Estate, Sale of, and proposals for Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, *July 20*, 1394.

Denny, Col. J. M. [Kilmarnock Burghs]
  Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1112, 1119, 1124.
  Volunteers.
    Services of, during the South African War, *July 13*, 599.
    War Office attitude towards, *July 13*, 597–599.

Derry M'Edmond Estate
  Advance to Mr. Frend, Decision as to.
    Q. Mr. Reddy; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 87, 88.

Derrycroff Bridge
  Erection of, proposed.
    Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1374.

Devlin, Mr. C. R. [Galway]
  Canada Immigrants to, from Continent of Europe, alleged Payment to Shipping Companies for, *July 20*, 1377.
  Constabulary, R. I.
    Masterson and Cryan, Charges against—Disappearance of Masterson, Inquiry into case of, etc., *July 17*, 886.
    Truncheon, Instructions as to use of, *July 17*, 884.
  Trade between Ireland and Great Britain, Separate Statistics as to, proposed, *July 20*, 1402.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Kilkenny N.]
  Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department—Officials, Names, Duties, and Salaries of, *July 19*, 1173.
  Belfast—Dundonald Cemetery.
    Alteration of Resolution as to Allocation of Ground for Roman Catholic Burials, *July 18*, 1068.
    Claim of Roman Catholics to discretionary Authority, *July 20*, 1389.
  Customs and Excise Duties, Allocation of Irish Share of, *July 19*, 1173.
  Excise Officers at Distilleries, loss of Public Holidays by, *July 10*, 64.
  France—Separation of Church and State—probable Effect on British Subjects owning Church Property in France, *July 20*, 1370.
  Glasgow—Information as to Partick Orange Disturbance, *July 10*, 63.
  Land Act, 1903.
    Intimidation, Regulations as to dealing with, *July 20*, 1452.
    Landlords, Interests of, upheld to detriment of those of Tenants alleged, *July 20*, 1452, 1453.
  Passengers on Railways and Tramways, Mr. J. Brown's Invention to facilitate taking up and putting down, *July 14*, 741.
  Threatening letters, increase of, in Cork County, etc., *July 19*, 1184.

Devonport
Dockyard, Upholstery Work allocated to Women at.
Q. Mr. Benn; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 10*, 69.
Overcrowding in, high Rents, etc.
Qs. Mr. Pretyman, *July 12*, 497, 498; Mr. Kearley, 498.

Devonshire
Anthrax Outbreak, Measures taken to cope with.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 19*, 1178.

Devonshire, Duke of
Fiscal Policy, *Motion* as to, postponed, *July 21*, 1501.
Physical Deterioration.
Anthropometric Survey to collect *data* as to, institution of, proposed, *July 20*, 1312, 1315, 1316, 1319.
Report of Inter-departmental Committee on, *July 20*, 1312–1319, 1352.

Dewar, Mr. J. A. [Inverness]
Hebrides, Rates in, Legislative proposals as to, *July 11*, 266.

Dewar Sir T. R. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
Accidents caused by covered Vans, number of Prosecutions, etc., *July 12*, 382.
Army Gymnasia, length of service of Chief Inspector of, *July 17*, 866.
Blake, Albert, Case of—Compensation for wrongful imprisonment, proposed, *July 19*, 1171.
Navy—Wireless Telegraphy System, application of, *July 11*, 247.
Poplar, Statistics as to Pauperism in, *July 13*, 533.
Postmen acting as Secretaries to Building Societies, rescinding Order prohibiting, proposed, *July 20*, 1373.

Dickson, Rt. Hon. C. S.—*Lord Advocate* [Glasgow, Bridgton]
Beaufort Castle Shooting Case.
Date of holding Trial, *July 20*, 1386.
Procedure as to, *July 13*, 562, 563.
Boys, Sea-training Scheme for—Applications received for course of training at Liscard Institution, Liverpool, *July 18*, 1067.
Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1108, 1109, 1111, 1112, 1116, 1117, 1119-1123, 1124-1126, 1128-1134, 1136, 1137; *July 19*, 1228-1230, 1236, 1237.
Government Amendments, placing, on Notice Paper, *July 10*, 86.
Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1090, 1091.
Tenure of Property by Free and United Free Churches, *July 17*, 883.

Dickson, Mr. S.—*cont.*
Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill, proposals as to, *July 11*, 266.
Edinburgh—Sasine Office Fines and Deductions from Earnings of Clerks during last five years, *July 13*, 533.
Education—Aberdeen Educational Trust Home, Date of Opening, Applications for Admission, etc., *July 18*, 1068.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 750, 758, 773–776, 788, 792, 794, 795, 797.
Fisheries.
"Norna," reason for Sale of, Amount realised, etc., *July 11*, 265.
"Pioneer" motor Boat, visit of, to Wick, proposed, *July 17*, 864.
Glasgow — Information as to Partick Orange Disturbance, *July 10*, 64.
Hebrides, Rates in—Legislative proposals to deal with question, *July 11*, 266.
Manufactures, Board of—Date of introducing Bill to carry out Committee Recommendations, *July 12*, 394.
Piers and Harbours—Avoch Harbour Works, Date of Completion of, *July 12*, 380.
Sunday Observance Statutes, Enforcement of, proposed, *July 13*, 562.
Vaccination Prosecutions.
Dundee, in, *July 10*, 70.
(1900–1905) *July 19*, 1181.
Workhouses, Aged Paupers in, in 1881, 1891, 1901, and 1904, *July 13*, 535.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. [Wilts, Chippenham]
Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral areas, Procedure in appointing Boundary Commission, *July 18*, 1077.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean]
Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 115, 136, 137, 148, 150–152, 181; *July 11*, 302; *Con.*, *July 17*, 943, 952, 965, 966.
China and Earthenware Manufactories, Number of, using Leadless Glaze conforming to Rule 2, *July 17*, 854.
Navy Loans Bills, Objections to System of, *July 19*, 1203.
Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas—Boundary Commision, Appointment of, Procedure as to, *July 18*, 1078.
Terms of Reference of, *July 20*, 1404, 1405.
Passengers to places out of Europe, Monthly Return as to, *July 13*, 536.

Diplomatic and Consular Service
Buildings—Statement as to Sum Required to make good Excess on Grant, Presented, *July 20*, 1364.

Diseases of Animals Acts
Ireland—Report of Agriculture, Department, Presented, *July 10*, 61 ; *July 11*, 216.

Disraeli, Mr. C. R. [Cheshire, Altrincham]
Big Ben, Control of, by First Commissioner of Works, *July 18*, 1067.
Boyle—Information as to Disturbances at House of Mr. Magennis, *July 18*, 1073, 1074.
Hazelgrove Disturbances, Information as to, *July 11*, 264.
Morocco—Conference between France and Germany, etc., Nations taking part in, Proposals received by Great Britain, etc., *July 17*, 873.

Distilleries
Excise Officers at, Loss of Public Holidays by.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 10*, 64.

Divisions
See under Parliamentary Procedure.

Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Rule)
Draft Additional Rule, Presented, *July 11*, 245.

Dobbie, Mr. J. [Ayr, Burghs]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 764, 781, 782.
Kyles of Bute, War Office Purchase of Land in, *July 18*, 1056, 1057.

Dockyards
See under Navy.

Dogs
Throwing into the Thames, Alleged Cruelty of—Police Powers of Interference, etc.
Qs. Col. Lockwood ; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 13*, 536 ; *July 17*, 875.

Dominica
Davies, Mr. W., Decision in case of.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 13*, 540.

Donelan, Capt. A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
Alien Immigration Ports in Ireland, Decision as to, *July 17*, 874.

Donoughmore, Earl of—*Under-Secretary for War.*
Cavalry Officers.
Commissions, Number of, Granted since the South African War, *July 18*, 1039.
Resignations from, since the South African War, Number of, *July 18*, 1039.
Shortage in, *July 18*, 1039, 1040.

Donoughmore, Earl of—*cont.*
Commands, Information as to Re-organisation of, *July 17*, 833–835.
Home Defence.
Invasion, Possibilities of, *July 10*, 24–27.
Navy as Sole Means of, Supplementing, by increased Land Defences, proposed, *July 10*, 23, 24.
Short Service Army not for Purposes of Home Defence, *July 10*, 46.
Horses suffering from Epizootic Lymphangitis.
Names of Military Centres from which disease spread, Return as to, proposed, *July 17*, 844.
Number affected, Progress made with stamping out disease, etc., *July 11*, 228 ; *July 17*, 838, 840.
South Africa, Horses shipped from, suffering from the disease, Return as to, *July 17*, 839, 840.
Military Requirements at Home and Abroad, Importance of ascertaining, *July 10*, 23.
Mobilisation Arrangements, Information as to, *July 17*, 833–835.
Preparedness for War, Condition of the Army not bettered since 1899, alleged, *July 10*, 23.
Yeomanry.
Army Manœuvres, Possibility of attaching Yeomanry Officers to, *July 17*, 824.
Drill Book, Provision of, *July 17*, 827.
Horsing of, in Cases of Emergency, Tabling Papers as to, *July 17*, 826, 832.
Mobilisation of, Arrangements for, *July 17*, 825.
Musketry and Signalling Schools, Establishment of, proposed, *July 17*, 823–825.
Officers, Senior, Classes and Lectures for, Establishment of, proposed, *July 17*, 823, 824.
Stores, Emergency, Arrangements as to Supply of, *July 17*, 826, 827.

Donovan's Divorce Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Doogan, Mr. P. C. [Tyrone, E.]
Coalisland.
Disturbance at House of Mr. Harkin, Efforts made to trace Offenders, etc., *July 20*, 1391.
McManus, J., Reason for summoning, *July 20*, 1390.
Constabulary, R.I.—Constable Finnigan, Reason for Transfer of, *July 20*, 1390.
Cookstown, Extension of Telephone Service to, proposed, *July 17*, 891.
Post Office—North of Ireland Evening Service *viâ* Greenore, proposed, *July 17*, 891.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Kent, St. Augustine's]
- Accidents.
  - Covered Vans, Caused by—Number of Prosecutions, etc., *July 12*, 382.
  - Mines, in—Period of time between Accident and Death necessary for Case to be described in Statistics as "Fatal Accident," *July 17*, 855.
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 120, 124, 125, 135, 138, 143-146; *July 11*, 293, 306 308, 337, 338, 344, 356; *Con.*, *July 17*, 904, 912-914, 923, 924, 988, 991; *July 18*; 1147, 1148; 3R., *July 19*, 1257-1259.
  - Expenses.
    - Buildings for Accommodation and Examination of Aliens—Payment by Shipowners, proposed, *July 11*, 279.
    - Estimated Cost of Administering the Act; *July 11*, 278, 285.
    - Limiting, to £10,000 or £24,000 annually, proposed, *July 11*, 278.
  - Irish Immigration Ports, Decision as to, *July 17*, 874.
  - Ports of Landing—Reason for Exclusion of Dover, *July 17*, 875, 876.
  - Shipping Companies, Provision for Protection of, *July 10*, 67.
- Blake, Albert, Case of—Compensation for Wrongful Imprisonment, proposed, *July 19*, 1172.
- Children.
  - Accidents to, in London Streets, Measures taken to safeguard Children, etc., *July 17*, 875.
  - Cruelty to, Report of Society for Prevention of—Number of Prosecutions, Nature of Offences, etc., *July 17*, 874.
  - Employment of—Street Trading by Girls, By-laws drafted by Local Authorities prohibiting, *July 13*, 561.
- China and Earthenware Manufactories—Number using Leadless Glaze conforming to Rule 2, *July 17*, 854.
- Courts of Summary Jurisdiction—Disposal of Fines, *July 18*, 1061, 1062.
- Dogs, Cruelty of Throwing, into the Thames, alleged—Police Powers of Interference, etc., *July 13*, 536; *July 17*, 875.
- Hyde Park Corner Traffic, Obstruction caused to, by Demonstration in favour of Unemployed Workmen Bill, *July 17*, 853.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—*cont.*
- Juvenile Offenders.
  - Detention of, while awaiting Trial, Regulations as to, *July 20*, 1369.
  - Special Courts for—Extension of System proposed, *July 13*, 556.
- London Street Traffic Commission Report, Date of Issuing, *July 11*, 262.
- Motors — Prosecutions — Using Fines for abating Dust Nuisance, proposed, *July 18*, 1062.
- Police, Metropolitan, Injuries caused to, while on duty, Compensation awarded, etc., *July 13*, 558-560.
- Prisons—Princetown Warders, Protection of, against Attacks, *July 13*, 561.
- Vaccination Exemption Certificates, Power of Magistrates in Refusing, *July 13*, 557.
- Wattstown Colliery Disaster, Inquiry into, proposed, Provision of Special Apparatus for Rescue Parties, etc., *July 20*, 1378, 1379.

Douglas, Mr. C. M. [Lanark, N.W.]
- Churches (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 12*, 442-447; *Com.*, *July 19*, 1227, 1228.

Dover
- Alien Immigration Port, Reason for not including as.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Runciman, Mr. Emmott; *As* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 17*, 875, 876.

Dover Harbour Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *July 17*, 802.

Down, County of
- Parliamentary Elections — New Member sworn for West Down Division, *July 17*, 902.
- South—Effect of Redistribution Proposals.
  - *Q.* Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 18*, 1083.

Drunkenness (Ireland) Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *July 10*, 4.
  - 2R. *July 14*, 733.
  - *Com.*, *July 17*, 844.
  - Report from Select Committee*, *July 18*, 1019
  - *Rep.** *July 20*, 1299.
  - 3R.* *July 21*, 1513.

Dublin
- Education Office, Promotions in.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 71, 72.
- Joint Stock Companies, etc., Capital and Rateable Valuation of—Return Presented, *July 18*, 1043.
- Marlborough Street Training College, Male Students in (1902-1905).
  - *Q.* Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 397.

[*cont*

Dublin—*cont.*

Metropolitan Police.

Report, Annual, Reason for Delay in Publishing.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 888.

Station Sergeants, Wearing of Number on Collar by, proposed.
Q Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 866.

Probate Court—Clerk of the Seat, Duties, Hours and Salary of.
Qs. Mr. Jas. O'Connor; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 18*, 1075, 1076.

Science, College of — Proposals as to Engineering School.
Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 12*, 401, 402.

Trinity College Estates, Proposals as to Sale of.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1391, 1392.

Dublin United Tramways Bill
l. Rep. July 11*, 214.
3R.*, *July 17*, 802.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill
l. Rep. July 11*, 214.
3R.* *July 14*, 685.

Duke, Mr. H. E. [Plymouth]
Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 166, 167; *Con.*, *July 17*, 935.

Dundee
Vaccination Prosecutions in.
Q. Sir. J. Leng; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 10*, 69, 70.

Dungloe
Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 12*, 384.

Dunnes Minors Estate
Evicted Tenant Talbot, Reinstatement of.
Qs. Mr Delany; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 18*, 1069, 1070.

Dunraven, Earl of
Land Act, 1903, Working of, Reason for Alleged failure, etc., *July 14*, 687, 713.
Public Roads (Ireland) Bill, 2R, *July 21*, 1512.

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H. [Kent, Dartford]
Harcourt, late Sir W., Proposals as to erection of Statue of, *July 18*, 1066.

Earl of Stamford's Cheshire Estate Bill •
l. Rep.* *July 11*, 214.
3R.* *July 14*, 685.
c. 1R.* *July 14*, 735.

East Ham
Education Act, Refusal to Administer, etc.—Government proposals as to Legislation.
Q. Mr. McKenna; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 866.

East India Loans (Railways) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 18*, 1164.

Ecclesiastical Discipline
See Ritualistic Practices.

Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill
l. 3R * *July 17*, 802.

Edinburgh
King's Park—Reason for Closing Upper Road to Motors.
Q. Sir L. McIver; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 13*, 535.

Sasine Office—Fines and Deductions from Earnings of Clerks during the last five years.
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 13*, 533.

Edinburgh Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
l. 1R.* and 2R.* *July 17*, 803.
3R.* *July 21*, 1498.

Education, Board of
President—Marquess of Londonderry.
Secretary—Sir W. R. Anson.

Education (England and Wales)
Continuation Classes, making Attendance at, Compulsory, proposed.
Os. Earl of Meath, *July 20*, 1325; Marquess of Londonderry, 1339.

Cookery and Domestic Hygiene, Facilities for Training in.
Os. Earl of Meath, *July 20*, 1325; Marquess of Londonderry, 1338.

East Ham, Refusal of, to administer Education Act—Government Proposals as to Legislation.
Q. Mr. McKenna; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 866.

Grants—Quarterly Instalments, Decision as to Continuation of Payment in.
Q. Sir A. Rollit; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 14*, 743.

Infants.

Attendance of, under five years of age to be optional.
O. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 20*, 1339.

Leicestershire Education Committee, Exclusion by, of Children under five years of age—Increase of amount of Grants for Infants, proposed.
Q. Sir C. McLaren; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 17*, 862, 863.

Schools, Inquiry into Methods employed in.
O. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 20*, 1338.

Education (England and Wales)—*cont.*

Log-Book, Regulations as to Removing.
Q. Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 20*, 1373, 1374.

Merionethshire, Payment of Grants in.
Q. Mr. O. Williams; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 10*, 85.

Rate—Proposals as to Relief of Necessitous Districts.
Q. Mr. L. Sinclair; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *July 10*, 96.

Retarded Children, Establishment of Special Schools for.
O. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 20*, 1338.

Rural Schools, Improvement in, proposed.
Os. Earl of Meath, *July 20*, 1324; Marquess of Londonderry, 1337.

Schools, Day Industrial, *see under* Reformatory and Industrial Schools.

Surrey Committee, Auditors' Report on Accounts of.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 10*, 68.

Teachers.

Pupil.

Grants Earned by Attendance at Schools Conducted for Private Profit.
Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 10*, 70.

Training of, Regulations as to, Presented, *July 10*, 3, 61.

Salaries—Payments in Advance, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 20*, 1370.

Time-tables, Regulation as to Unavoidable Temporary Disturbance of.
Q. Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 17*, 863.

Vote, Date of taking.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 12*, 385.

Watford Grammar School—Proposals as to addition of Girls' Department, Local Opinion of scheme, etc.
Q. Mr. Slack; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 17*, 863, 864.

Education (Ireland)

Afflicted Children, Source of Grant for.
Qs. Mr. Clancy; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1399.

Banogue School Arrangements, Authority for.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 396.

Dublin — Marlborough Street Training College, Male Students in (1902-1905).
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 397.

Dublin Office, Promotion of Assistant Clerks in.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 71, 72.

Education (Ireland)—*cont.*

Extra Subjects, Fees paid for—Modificatio
of Circular.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Long
July 13, 537.

Intermediate—Rules and Programme c
Examinations (1906), Presented, *Jul*
20, 1299, 1363.

Irish Language—*see that title.*

Kindergarten—Regulations for Teachin
and Training of Teachers.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Long
July 12, 395.

Lislea Manager, Appointment of.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Long, *Jul*
11, 251.

National School Teachers.

English Teachers employed in Iris
Schools.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr
Long, *July 12*, 397.

Political Discussions at Meetings
Tabling Circular as to, etc., pro
posed.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Long
July 10, 89, 90.

Salaries of, under New Rules.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Long, *Jul*
20, 1397, 1398.

Salaries of Class 1, under New Code.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Long
July 13, 537.

Rule 127 (b).

Commissioners dissenting from, a
Meeting, Tabling Protest of.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. Long
July 19, 1184, 1185.

Reason for making.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Long
July 12, 395, 396.

Rules—Procedure in making and revis
ing—Subjects discussed at Meeting
of 20th December, 1904, etc.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. Long
July 19, 1185.

Schools.

Amalgamation of Boys' and Girls
Schools, Objection of Roman
Catholic Bishops to.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr.
Long, *July 17*, 887, 888;
July 20, 1395, 1396.

Building Plans, Date of issuing.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. V. Cav-
endish, *July 12*, 402; *July 20*
1400.

Mixed Schools under a Master, Provision of Female Teacher for.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Long,
July 12, 395, 396.

Education (Scotland)

Aberdeen Educational Trust Home—Date of opening — Applications for Admission to, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 18*, 1068.

Education (Scotland) Bill
- *c. Com.*, *July 14*, 746.
- *Debate in Committee* [Commons] *July 14*, 746.
  - Areas.
    - Boundary Commission, Appointment of, proposed, 757, 758.
    - County, Substitution of, for County Districts for Purposes of Secondary Education, proposed, 747–764.
    - Local Government Areas, Advantages of, 776.
    - Parish Areas, retaining, as School Board Area, proposed, 752, 756, 765–790.
  - Attendances at School, Exemptions from, Importance of getting Local Opinions as to, 771.
  - Districts.
    - Combination of.
      - Notice of, to be given to all Parties interested, proposed, 793–795.
      - Powers as to, for Purposes of Higher Education, proposed, 755, 756.
    - Sub-division of Large Districts, Powers as to, 757, 758, 774, 775.
      - Notice to be given to all Parties interested, proposed, 793–795.
      - Preserving School Board Districts under Existing Laws, proposed, 796–798.
      - Representations by Parish Councils, Preserving Right of, 791, 792.
  - Expenditure increased by the Bill, alleged, 747–751, 755.
  - Highlands, Retention of Parochial System in, proposed, 750, 751.
  - Managers to be appointed by School Boards instead of Parish Councils, 771.
  - Parochial School System, Retention of, proposed, 752, 756, 765–790.
  - Passing into Law this Session, Opportunity for, 776–778, 782.
  - School Boards.
    - Delegation of Work to Managers, Powers as to, 771.
    - Local Representation on, Necessity for, 754, 755, 770, 780.
    - Travelling Expenses of Members of, Payment of, proposed, 748.
  - Scottish Opinion in favour of the Bill, 769, 773, 774, 776, 783.
  - Teachers.
    - Salaries and Promotions, Effect of Larger Area on, 769, 781.
    - *Status* of, Necessity for Improvement in, 781.

Education (Scotland) Bill—*cont.*
- Instruction to Committee—Member prevented from moving Motion on Second Reading by error from the Chair, possibility of moving on Committee Stage.
  - *Os.* Mr. Black, *July 14*, 745, 746; Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Speaker, 746.
- Possibility of passing into Law this Session, 506.
  - *O.* Mr. J. Redmond, *July 12*, 507.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Pirie; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 12*, 410.
  - *Q.* Sir J. Tuke; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1407.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *July 11*, 242.

Egypt
- Trade Report Presented, *July 21*, 1500.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *July 11*, 215.
  - *Com.** *July 13*, 510.
  - 3R.* *July 14*, 685.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *July 11*, 215.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *July 11*, 215.
  - *Rep.** *July 14*, 685.
  - *Com.** *July 13*, 510.
  - 3R.* *July 17*, 803.
- *c.* Lords' Amendments *Con.** *July 19*, 1169.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *July 11*, 242.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
- *l.* *Rep.** *July 10*, 3.
  - 3R.* *July 11*, 216.
- *c.* 1R.* *July 11*, 244.

Ellenborough, Lord
- Dissemination of News previous to Outbreak of War and in time of War, Government Control over—Japanese Laws, etc., *July 13*, 512–518.
- Home Defence.
  - Invasion, Possibilities of, *July 10*, 19–23.
  - Navy as sole means of, Supplementing, by increased Land Defences, Proposed, *July 10*, 19, 22.

Ellice, Capt. E. C. [St. Andrews Burghs]
  Aliens Bill, *Com., July 10,* 169.
  Macedonia, Financial Control of—Turkish Government Decision as to Proposed System, *July 20,* 1378.

Elliot, Mr. A. R. D. [Durham]
  Churches (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 12,* 439–442 ; *Com., July 19,* 1239.

Ellis, Mr. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
  Cape Colony Convict Labour System, Information as to, *July 10,* 62.
  India—Lord Curzon, Reported Resignation of, *July 10,* 71.
  Motor Car Acts, Working of—Proposal as to Inquiry, *July 10,* 83.
  Spanish Bull-fight, Sanction of Admiralty to presence of British Admiral at, *July 17,* 865.

Emigration and Immigration
  Aliens arriving in 1904 as shown in Board of Trade Return.
    Q. Mr. S. Samuel ; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 17,* 881.
  Numbers and Nationalities of Persons leaving the United Kingdom for places outside Europe, Return respecting.
    Ordered and Presented, *July 11,* 239.
    Wording, etc., of Return.
      Os. Earl Spencer, Marquess of Lansdowne, Lord James of Hereford, *July 11,* 240.
      Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 13,* 536, 537.
      Q. Mr. Levy ; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 18,* 1048.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
  Aliens Bill, *Com., July 10,* 144, 162–166 ; *July 11,* 289–291, 294, 295, 297, 308 ; *Con., July 17,* 903, 920, 936 ; *July 18,* 1157.
    Dover, Reason for not including as Port of Landing, *July 17,* 876.
  Nigeria, Northern—Decision as to Railway Development, *July 13,* 547.

Epizootic Lymphangitis
  See under Horses.

Esk Valley Power-Gas Order Confirmation Bill
  l. 1R.* *July 11,* 215.
    3R.* *July 21,* 1498.

Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Wexford, N.]
  Dominica—Decision in Case of Mr. W. Davies, *July 13,* 540.
  Franciscan Manuscripts, progress made with Printing, *July 11,* 250.
  Gold Ornaments recently found in Ireland, *July 11,* 249.
  Pouldûff Pier Works, Decision as to, *July 11,* 251.

Essex
  Motor Speed Regulations—Resolution o County Council as to Penalty fo Breaches of Act.
    Q. Sir C. Rasch ; *A.* Mr. G. Bal four, *July 10,* 83.

Evictions (Ireland)
  [*For particular places, see their names.*
  Notices Filed during Quarter ended Jun 30, Return Presented, *July 18,* 1019 1042.
  Reinstatements.
    Delay in Effecting, under Land Act Reason for.
      Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14* 688 ; Marquess of London derry, 714 ; Mr. Murphy *July 20,* 1446 ; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 1449 ; Mr. Boland 1450–1462 ; Mr. Lundon 1460–1462.
    Estates Commissioners.
      Number Effected by, Assistance Granted, &c.
        Q. Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 17,* 888.
      Powers of, under New Regulations
        Qs. Mr. Murphy, Mr. Power ; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 13,* 564, 565.
    Funds for, Sources of.
      O. Mr. Kilbride, *July 20,* 1465, 1466.
    Regulations, New, Effect of, on.
      Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *July 20,* 1424 ; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1437 ; Mr. Atkinson, 1473 ; Mr. Long, 1482.
  Unoccupied Farm forming Portion of Estate, Powers of Estates Commissioners to define as an Estate for purpose of Reinstatement.
    Q. Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 11,* 267.

Factories and Workshops
  Medical Examination of Employees—Recommendations of Physical Deterioration Committee.
    Os. Earl of Meath, *July 20,* 1323, 1324.
  Women, Employment of, before and after Child-birth—Further Legislation, proposed.
    Os. Earl of Meath, *July 20,* 1324 ; Lord Shuttleworth, 1332, 1333 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 1340.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
  Evicted Tenants, Delay in Reinstatement of, *July 20,* 1449.
  Fair-rent Appeals, Delay in dealing with, *July 20,* 1449, 1450.
  Land Act, 1903, Failure of, *July 20,* 1448.

Faversham

Sewage Discharge and Pollution of Thames Estuary.
Q. Mr. Cohen ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 19*, 1179.

Fellowes, Rt. Hon. A. E.—*President of the Board of Agriculture* [Hunts, Ramsey]

Anthrax Outbreak in Devonshire, Measures taken to cope with, *July 19*, 1178.

Canadian Cattle Restrictions, Removal of, proposed, *July 13*, 553.

Fruit Industry, Adoption of Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry into, *July 19*, 1178.

"Kew Bulletin," Reason for Discontinuing Publication of, Completion of Volume for 1901, etc., *July 11*, 246.

Poisons used for Agricultural Purposes, Legislation to Regulate Sale of, *July 13*, 553.

Scottish Agricultural Commission Report, Distribution of, proposed, *July 11*, 246.

Sheep Scab Regulations, Effect of, on Oswestry Market, *July 18*, 1045.

Swine Fever.
Investigations into Causes and Symptoms—Date of Presenting Report, *July 11*, 248.
Outbreaks in 1903 and 1904, *July 11*, 247

Fenwick, Mr. C. [Northumberland, Wansbeck]

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 129, 131, 136, 138 ; 3R., *July 19*, 1287, 1288.

Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 101.

Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Manchester, N.E.]

Churches (Scotland) Bill, *com.*, *July 19*, 1239.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, Withdrawal of, proposed, *July 10*, 109.

Fermoy

Telephone Extension to, proposed.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 20*, 1401.

Feversham, Earl of

Public Meetings (Facilities) Bill, 3R., *July 14*, 733.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]

Cotton, Gambling in, Proposals as to Prevention of, *July 20*, 1375.

Dublin City, Reason for Proclamation of, under Crimes Act, *July 10*, 87.

Gambling in futures, Proposals as to International Measures to prevent, *July 14*, 739, 740.

Land Purchase—Regulations as to Purchase of Town Holdings, *July 20*, 1478.

Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 534.

Findlay, Mr. A. [Lanark, N.E.]

Churches (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 12*. 458–459.

Education (Scotland) Bill, *com.*, *July 14*, 786.

Finlay, Sir R. B.—*Attorney-General* [Inverness Burghs]

Aliens Bill, *com.*, *July 10*, 115, 116, 128, 129, 149, 150 ; *July 11*, 296–298, 301, 308, 331, 342, 343, 348, 349, 351, 354, 355 ; *con. July 17*, 919, 920, 937, 938, 950, 966, 974, 979, 980, 986 ; *July 18*, 1158.

Fire

Protection of Life from—Report from Select Committee Presented, *July 20*, 1408.

First Commissioner of Works
Lord Windsor.

First Lord of the Admiralty
Earl of Cawdor.

First Lord of the Treasury
Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.

Fiscal Policy

Devonshire, Duke of, Motion of, postponed.
Os. Duke of Devonshire, Earl of Halsbury, *July 21*, 1501.

Government Policy as to Reform.
Qs. Mr. Black ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *July 12*, 408,

Vote of Censure in name of Rt. Hon. Member for Berwick, Day for discussion of.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 10*, 102, 105 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 103–106 ; Mr. Caldwell, Sir H. Fowler, 106 ; Sir H. Campbell - Bannerman ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 1191.

Fisheries, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. A. E. Fellowes.

Fisheries

Ireland—Motor Fishing-Boat, Experiments as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 18*, 1068.

North Sea Fisheries Investigation Committee Report (1902–1903) Presented, *July 13*, 511, 532.

Port of Registry for British Sea-fishing Boats, Order constituting Burntisland as, Presented, *July 17*, 805, 850.

Scotland.
Caithness and Sutherland Sea Fisheries, Report on, Presented, *July 10*, 3, 61.
"Norna," Reason for sale of, Amount realised, &c.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 11*, 265.
"Pioneer" Motor Boat, Visit of, to Wick, proposed.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth ; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 17*, 864.

Fitzmaurice, Lord E. G. P. [Wilts, Cricklade]
  Aliens Bill, *Com., July 10*, 116, 127, 167, 168; *Con. July 17*, 912, 944-946.
  Channel Tunnel, Proposals as to proceeding with, *July 20*, 1385.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
  Cragg and Ardcrone Farms, Acquisition and Disposal of, *July 18*, 1073.
  Dublin—Trinity College Estates, Proposal as to Sale of, *July 20*, 1392.
  Kerry.
    Criminal Cases at Assizes, Condition of County, &c., *July 18*, 1074.
    Evicted Tenants, Re-instatement of, *July 10*, 95.
  Luggacurran Estate, Re-instatements effected on, *July 18*, 1071.
  Malicious Injury, Definition of, *July 19*, 1184.
  Parks, Traffic Regulations in, *July 11*, 265.
  Police, Metropolitan, Injuries caused to, while on duty, Compensation awarded, etc., *July 13*, 560.
  Poor Law Commission—Date of issuing Report, Local Inquiries remaining to be made, etc., *July 18*, 1073.
  Trade between Ireland and Great Britain, Separate Statistics as to, proposed, *July 20*, 1402.

Floughena
  O'Connor Estate—Provision for Reinstatement of Children of late T. Durkan.
    Q. Mr, O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 856, 857.

Flower, Sir E. F. S. [Bradford, W.]
  Land Act (Ireland) 1903.
    Vendors of Estates, Two-thirds of Purchase Money to be taken by, in Stock, and one-third in Cash, proposed, *July 20*, 1455, 1456.
    Working of, *July 20*, 1455.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
  Alien Immigration Ports in Ireland, Decision as to, *July 17*, 874.
  Aliens Bill, *Com., July 11*, 332, 333, 346, 348, *Con., July 17*, 986.
  Coalisland—Disturbance at House of Mr. Harkin, Efforts made to trace Offenders, etc., *July 20*, 1391.
  Cork Assizes—Number of Jurymen challenged in case of J. Colbert, *July 20*, 1388.
  Cork County, Condition of, as to Cases of Intimidation, etc., *July 19*, 1183, 1184.
  Holborn Borough Council Accounts—Decision as to Proceedings against Mr. L. H. Isaacs, *July 10*, 84; *July 19*, 1180, 1181.
  India, Press Censorship in, *July 11*, 261.

Flynn, Mr. J. C.—*cont.*
  Land Act (Ireland) 1903.
    Failure of, *July 20*, 1442, 1443.
    Intimidation, Regulations as to dealing with, *July 20*, 1444, 1445.
    Regulations issued to Commissioners, Policy of Concealment as to, *July 20*, 1443, 1444.
  Militia Reorganisation Proposals, Opportunity for discussing, *July 11*, 268.
  Parliamentary Representation of Ireland in 1832, 1842 and 1852, if calculated on a population basis, *July 13*, 543.

Fog Signals
  Syrens on the Coast, etc., Means of working, Cost of Machinery, etc.
    Q. Maj. Jameson; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 17*, 852, 853.

Food
  Standard of Purity, Appointment of Special Inspector to deal with.
    Os. Lord Kenyon, *July 20*, 1347.

Foreign Office
  Secretary of State—Marquess of Lansdowne.

Foreign Prison-made Goods
  Exclusion of—Increase in Amount excluded since Last Statement.
    Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 21*, 1519.

Formby Township Bill
  c. Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *July 13*, 531.
    Con. July 18*, 1041.

Foster, Sir B. W. [Derby, Ilkeston]
  Midwifery Orders, Issue of, by relieving Officers to Women unable to obtain the Services of Registered Midwife, proposed, *July 17*, 864.
  Norwood Poor Law Schools, Outbreak of Diptheria in, *July 18*, 1046.
  South African War Honours, Reason for non-award of, to Volunteer Medical Corps, *July 14*, 745.

Fowler, Rt. Hon Sir H. H. [Wolverhampton, E.]
  Fiscal Policy—Vote of Censure of Member for Berwick, Day for Discussion of, *July 10*, 106.
  Indian Army Administration—Speech of Viceroy at Viceregal Council, *July 19*, 1175, 1176.
  Redistribution Proposals of the Government, information as to, *July 10*, 106.
  Supply, Allocation of Time to, *July 18*, 1084; *July 19*, 1187-1190.

France
  Church and State, Separation of—Probable Effect on British Subjects owning Church Property in France.
    Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 20*, 1370, 1371.
  Trade Report Presented, *July 18*, 1019.

French, Major, Estate of
Purchase of, and Disposal of Grazing Lands.
Q. Mr. Jas. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1389.

Fruit Industry
Committee of Inquiry into, Adoption of Recommendations of.
Q. Mr. Higham; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 19*, 1177, 1178.

Fuller, Mr. J. M. F. [Wilts, Westbury]
Aliens Bill, *Com, July 11*, 329–331, 343.
Volunteers.
Ammunition allowance per man, *July 12*, 390.
Medical Examination, Provision for defraying Cost of, *July 12*, 390.
Reduction in Number of, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 616, 617.
Wiltshire, Redistribution Proposals as to, *July 17*, 893.

Galloway, Mr. W. J. [Manchester, S.W.]
Aliens Bill — Expenses — Buildings for Accommodation and Examination of Aliens, Payment for, by Shipowners, proposed, *July 11*, 280.

Galway
Jurors, special, Qualifications of.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 95, 96.

Gambling
Futures, in, Prevention of—Proposals as to Introduction of International Repressive Measures.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 14*, 739.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
c. Rep. July 13*, 530.
3R.* *July 14*, 734.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 10*, 60.
Rep. July 18*, 1041.
Con. July 19*, 1169.
3R.* *July 20*, 1363.

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill
c. 3R.* *July 10*, 60.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*, July 21*, 1498.

Germany
Coalfield in Wales, Purchase of, *see* Coal—Welsh Coalfield.
Marshall Islands, British Trade with—Termination of German Government Agreement with Jaluit Company.
Os. Earl of Jersey, *July 13*, 527, 528; Marquess of Lansdowne, 528, 529.
Rhenish Westphalian Coal, Iron, and Steel Syndicates, Export Bounties paid by.
Q. Sir T. Wrightson; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 18*, 1048.
Trade Report Presented, *July 21*, 1500.

Glasgow
Duke Street Prison—Rule as to Appointment of Visiting Committee Presented, *July 10*, 3, 61; *July 11*, 244.
Partick Orange Disturbance, Information as to.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 10*, 63, 64.

Glasgow Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
l. 2R.* and *Rep.* July 14*, 685.
3R.* *July 21*, 1499.

Glasgow Corporation (Tramways Consolidation) Order Confirmation Bill
l. 2R.* and *Rep.**, *July 21*, 1499.

Glasgow University Order Confirmation Bill
l. 1R.* 2R.* and *Rep.* July 20*, 1298.

Gordon, Major W. E. [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Aliens Bill, *Com., July 10*, 132, 169–172, 181; *July 11*, 341; *Con., July 17*, 952, 955–962, 965; *July 18*, 1147; 3R., *July 19*, 1264–1269, 1272, 1273.
Expenses—Buildings for Accommodation and Examination of Aliens, Payment of, by Ship-owners, proposed, *July 11*, 283.
Army Bands—Regulations as to pitch of Instruments, *July 13*, 541.
Compulsory Military Service, War Office Attitude towards, *July 13*, 614.
Transvaal—Company Law.
Barnato and Johannesburg Consolidated Investment Companies, Amalgamation of, *July 10*, 84.
Joint Stock Enterprises, Amendments of Law as to, *July 10*, 82.
Volunteers—Circular requiring Reports from Commanding Officers as to Efficiency of Units, *July 13*, 614–616.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E. [Cambridge University.]
Labour Problem, Inquiry into—Proposals as to utilising Services of Mr. R. Haggard, *July 17*, 877.

Gortfada
Sheep missed by M. O'Connor, Efforts made by Police to find, etc.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 19*, 1172, 1173.

Goschen, Viscount
Home Defence.
Invasion, possibilities of, *July 10*, 27–29.
Navy as sole means of, supplementin by increased Land Defences, proposed, *July 10*, 27, 28.
Raids, possibility of—Strengthening Land Defences, proposed, *July 10*, 30–32.
Volunteers, value of, *July 10*, 29–30.

Gosport and Fareham Tramways Bill
c. *Con.** *July 11*, 242.
3R.* *July 14*, 734.

Govan
Parliamentary Representation under Redistribution Proposals.
Q. Mr. H. Craig ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 879.

Government
Defeat of, in the Division Lobbies.
Cordite Vote, Course followed by Liberal Government when defeated on.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1493, 1496 ; *July 21*, 1521, 1522 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1520, 1521.
Course of Business—Adjournment of the House till Monday, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *July 20*, 1494 ; Mr. McKenna, 1494 ; Mr. Asquith, 1495 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1495, 1496 ; Mr. Bryce, 1496 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1496.
Gladstone's Government of 1885, Procedure followed on Defeat of.
Os. Mr. Bryce, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 21*, 1523.
House of Lords Business, Effect on—Position of the Government, etc.
Os. Earl Spencer, *July 21*, 1514, 1515 ; Earl of Halsbury, 1515 ; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1515, 1516.
Resignation, Statement as to.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 20*, 1489 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1490–1496 ; Mr. J. Redmond, 1490, 1494.

Government Contracts
Return of Contracts during 1904–1905—Ordered, *July 20*, 1364.
Waygood, Messrs., refusal of, to employ Union Men, alleged.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie ; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 14*, 742.

Gray, Mr. E. [West Ham, N.]
Civil Service Assistant Clerks—Payment for Overtime, *July 17*, 860.
Customs Vote, Date of taking, *July 10*, 99.
Education.
Log Book, Regulations as to removing, *July 20*, 1373.
Teachers' Salaries—Regulations as to Payments in Advance, *July 20*, 1370.
Time Tables, Regulation as to unavoidable Temporary Disturbance of, *July 17*, 863.

Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill
c. *Con.** *July 17*, 849.
3R.* *July 20*, 1362.

Great Northern, Piccadilly and Brompton Railway (No. 1) Bill
l. 3R.* *July 21*, 1498.

Great Northern Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill
*l. Rep.** *July 18*, 1017.
3R.* *July 21*, 1497.

Great Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill
l. 3R.* *July 10*, 2.
c. Lords' Amendts, *Con.** *July 14*, 734.

Great Western Railway (New Railways) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
Calcutta, Government Acquisition of Land in, *July 18*, 1051.

Guest, Mr. I. C. [Plymouth]
Aliens Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 988, 989.
Churches (Scotland) Bill—Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1097.

Gurteen
Petty Sessions—Case of Sergeant Dunphy and Constable Daly, Action of Lord Ashtown, etc.
Qs. Mr. Reddy ; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 13*, 566, 567.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B. [Haddington]
Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1126, 1129, 1131 ; *July 19*, 1223–1225.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 786.

Hall, Mr. E. M. [Lancashire, Southport]
Municipal Corporations, Financial Position of—Inquiry proposed, *July 10*, 63.

Halsbury, Earl of—*Lord Chancellor.*
Convocations of the Clergy Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 722, 732.
Drunkenness (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 733 ; *Com.*, *July 17*, 847.
Fiscal Policy—Postponement of Motion by Duke of Devonshire, *July 21*, 1501.
Government Defeat in the Division Lobbies, Effect of, on House of Lords business, Position of the Government, etc., *July 21*, 1515.
London County Council (Tramways) Bill.
Instruction to Committee moving of, before Bill read a second time—out of order. *July 18*, 1016.
Postponement of Second Reading for three months, proposed, *July 18*, 1012–1014, 1016.

[*cont.*

Halsbury, Earl of—*cont.*
- Newspapers, Propriety of Reading from, During Debate, *July 10*, 52.
- South African War Stores—Royal Commission of Inquiry—Powers of Sub-Commission in South Africa, *July 10*, 58.
- War Stores (Commission) Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 58.

Halsey, Rt. Hon. T. F. [Hertfordshire, Watford]
- Administrative County of London Electric Power Company Bill, Committee on, Members of, Voting on Second Reading, Appointment of Members financially interested, etc., *July 11*, 271, 272.

Harcourt, late Sir W.
- Proposals as to Erection of Statue of, within the precincts.
  - *Q.* Sir W. H. Dyke; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 18*, 1066.

Hardie, Mr. J. K. [Merthyr Tydvil]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 131–134, 137, 138; *Con.*, *July 17*, 921, 922.
- Closure, Discretion of Speaker as to moving, *July 12*, 499.
- Navy.
  - Dockyards.
    - Deputations from Workmen, Practice of Admiralty as to receiving, *July 12*, 491, 493.
    - Discharges from, *July 12*, 492.
    - Wages, Decrease in, and Increase in Salaries, Reasons for, *July 12*, 492, 493.
    - Working Short Time, proposed, *July 12*, 495.
  - Shipbuilding, Comparative Cost of, in Government and Private Yards, *July 12*, 492.
- Post Office Wages and alleged Political Pressure by Staff to obtain Increases —Deputation to Negotiate Disputes, proposed, *July 18*, 1063.
- Rhondda Valley Mining Disaster—Vote of Sympathy with Relatives of Victims, proposed, *July 12*, 413.
- Unemployed, Work for—Powers of Poor Law Guardians under Act 42, Eliz., c. 2., etc., *July 19*, 1179, 1180.
- Unemployed Workmen Bill.
  - Date of Taking, *July 10*, 96–98; *July 20*, 1408.
  - Possibility of Passing into Law this Session, *July 12*, 410–412, 507; *July 13*, 571.
- Wattstown Colliery Disaster, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 20*, 1379.
- Waygood & Co., Messrs., Refusal of, to Employ Union Men, alleged, *July 14*, 742.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]
- Fisheries—"Pioneer" Motor Boat, Visit of, to Wick, proposed, *July 17*, 864.
- Trawling in Scotch Waters, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 17*, 868.

Harrington, Mr. T. [Dublin Harbour]
- Licensing Cases in Dublin—Procedure in Issuing Summonses, *July 20*, 1366.

Harris, Lord
- Army.
  - Commands, Information as to Reorganisation of, *July 17*, 834.
  - Mobilisation Arrangements, Information as to, *July 17*, 834.
- Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 21*, 1498.
- Yeomanry.
  - Horsing of, in cases of emergency, Tabling Papers as to, proposed, *July 17*, 819, 832.
  - Mobilisation of, Arrrangements for, Tabling Papers relating to, propoesd, *July 17*, 818, 819.
  - Musketry and Signalling Schools, Establishment of, proposed, *July 17*, 821.
  - Stores, Emergency, Arrangements as to supply of, *July 17*, 819, 820, 826.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 299, 356; *Con.*, *July 17*, 938, 939; *July 18*, 1152.
- Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1252–1254.

Hastings Tramways Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Haulbowline
- Naval Dockyards at, Improving position of, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. H. Robertson, *July 12*, 482; Mr. A. Lee, 486.

Hawarden, Viscount
- Representative Peers for Ireland, Claim to Vote at Election of—Presented, *July 13*, 509.
  - Established, *July 20*, 1297; *July 21*, 1497.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 137, 182; *July 11*, 305–307; *Con.*, *July 17*, 924.
- Civil Service Assistant Clerks, Salaries of, *July 12*, 383.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]
- Irish Language, Use of, in signing Postal Orders—Case of Mr. T. O'Heidhin, *July 18*, 1076.
- Roscommon Assizes—Result of "Crown *v.* Reid" case, *July 20*, 1387, 1388.

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D. [Walsall]

Macedonian disturbances — Adrianople refugees in Bulgaria, Information as to, *July 13*, 535.

Volunteers.

Circular requiring Reports from Commanding Officers as to Efficiency of Units, etc., *July 13*, 612.

Reduction in number of, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 612–614.

Hazelgrove

Disturbances, Information as to, Number of Arrests, etc.

Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Disraeli; *As.* Mr. Cochrane, *July 11*, 263, 264.

Hebrides

See also names of islands, as Lewis, Island of.

Rates in, Legislative proposals as to question of.

Q. Mr. J. Dewar; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 11*, 266.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]

Navy Dockyards.

Deputations from Workmen, Practice of Admiralty as to receiving, *July 12*, 494.

Salaries, Increase in, and Decrease in Wages, Reasons for, *July 12*, 495.

Unemployed Workmen Bill, Possibility of Passing into law this Session, *July 12*, 505; *July 13*, 570.

Heneage, Lord

Army—Cavalry Officers.

Resignations from, Number of—Number of Commissions granted since South African War, etc., *July 18*, 1039.

Shortage in, *July 18*, 1039.

Convocations of the Clergy Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 724.

Horses suffering from Epizootic Lymphangitis, Number of Army Horses affected, Progress made with stamping out disease, etc., *July 11*, 228.

Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies) Bill, 2R., *July 11*, 220.

Hessle Gas Bill

c. 3R* *July 10*, 59.

Higham, Mr. J. S. [Yorkshire, West Riding, Sowerby]

Fruit Industry, Adoption of Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry into, *July 19*, 1177, 1178.

Highland Railway Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Historical Manuscripts Commission

Rutland, Duke of, Report on Manuscripts of, Presented, *July 10*, 3, 61.

Hitchin and District Gas Bill

c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* *July 10*, 59.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. [Bristol, E.]

Army Enlistments, April–June, from 1897 to 1905, *July 12*, 384.

Volunteers.

Active Foreign Service, Number of Battalions fit for, *July 10*, 78–80.

Camping Regulations, Relaxation of, proposed, *July 13*, 604.

Circular to Commanding Officers asking for Reports as to Efficiency of Units, etc., *July 13*, 602.

Disbandment of Battalions—Liability for Legitimate Expenditure, *July 10*, 77.

Duties of, Definition of, *July 13*, 600, 601.

Musketry Allowance, Increasing, proposed, *July 13*, 604.

Reduction in Number of, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 600–602.

Separate Representation at the War Office, proposed, *July 13*, 603.

Holborn Borough Council

Commission paid to Borough Council Clerk by Messrs. Bircham—Letter from Finance Committee, etc.

Q. Mr. Benn: *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 877, 878.

Isaacs, Mr. L. H., Decision as to proceedings against.

Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour. *July 10*, 84; *July 19*, 1180, 1181.

Hollesley Bay

Labour Colony, Result of Experiment as to.

Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 876, 877.

Home Office

Secretary of State—Rt, Hon. A. A. Douglas.

Under-Secretary—Mr T. H. Cochrane.

Hope, Mr. J. F.—[Sheffield, Brightside]

Aliens Bill, *Com., July 10*, 175; *Con.*, 937.

Army Bayonets, Allocation of Orders for, *July 10*, 75; *July 18*, 1056.

Big Ben, Face of, Reason for illuminating with Green Light, *July 18*, 1067.

Navy—Orders for Armour Plate, *July 11*, 246.

Unemployed Workmen Bill—Possibility of passing into law this Session, *July 12*, 506.

Horses

Epizootic Lymphangitis. Outbreak in Ireland.

Army Horses, Number affected, Progress made with stamping out Disease, etc.
Os. Lord Onslow, *July 11*, 227, 228 ; Earl of Donoughmore, Lord Burghclere, Lord Henage, Earl of Mayo, 228. Lord Burghclere, *July 17*, 836 ; Earl of Donoughmore, 838, 840.

Civilian Stables, in.

Number of cases.
Os. Earl of Mayo, *July 11*, 220 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 223 ; Lord Wolverton, *July 17*, 840–841.

Origin of, Information as to.
Os. Lord Burghclere, Lord Wolverton, *July 17*, 844.

Compensation for Animals slaughtered, Basis of.
Os. Lord Tweedmouth, *July 11*, 226 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 227.

Compulsory Inspection of all Horses and Mules in Infected Areas, proposed
Os. Earl of Mayo, *July 11*, 221.

Measures taken to eradicate.
Q. Mr. Power ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 13*, 539.

Measures taken to prevent Incursion of, into England.
Os. Lord Burghclere, *July 11*, 226 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 227 ; Lord Burghclere, *July 17*, 837.

Military Authorities, Responsibility of, for Introduction of the Disease.
Os. Earl Spencer, *July 11*, 224, 226 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 227 ; Lord Burghclere, *July 17*, 837, 839 ; Earl of Donoughmore, 840 ; Earl Spencer, 842.

Names of Military Centres from which Disease spread, Return as to, proposed.
Os. Earl Spencer, *July 17*, 842 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 843, 844; Lord Tweedmouth, Earl of Donoughmore, 844.

Number of Horses destroyed, Number in Quarantine, etc.
Os. Earl of Mayo, *July 11*, 220 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 223, 224.

Outbreak in England, Information as to.
Os. Lord Wolverton, *July 17*, 840, 841 ; Earl of Mayo, 841 ; Earl Spencer, 841, 842.

Horses—*cont.*

Epizootic Lymphangitis Outbreak in Ireland—*cont.*

Regulations laid down in Circular of 1904, Measures taken to enforce.
Os. Earl of Mayo, *July 11*, 220 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 222, 223 ; Earl Spencer, 224, 225 ; Lord Tweedmouth, 225, 226 ; Lord Burghclere, *July 17*, 836 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 843.

Return of Number of Horses shipped from South Africa which were affected by the Disease, etc., proposed.
Os. Lord Burghclere, *July 17*, 836 ; Earl of Donoughmore, 839.

Waterford Horses, Prohibition of Movement of.
Q. Mr. O'Shee ; *A.* Mr. Long ; *July 13*, 539, 540.

Ireland—Carriage Horses, Encouragement of breeding of, proposed
Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 398.

Hoult, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Wirrall]
Minister of Commerce, Proposals as to, *July 20*, 1376.

Houses
Owners of, Taking steps to secure Accurate Register of.
Os. Earl of Meath, *July 20*, 1323 ; Lord Kenyon, 1344.

Housing of the Working Classes
Rural Housing, Powers of District Councils as to.
Os. Lord Kenyon, *July 20*, 1347.

Howard, Mr. Joseph [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Customs House Statistical Office, Promotions available to Clerks in, *July 18*, 1047.

Humber Conservancy Bill
*c. Rep.** *July 18*, 1041.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Aliens Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 932.
Army.
Cavalry Saddles, Weight of, etc., *July 13*, 680.
Rifles, Defects in, *July 13*, 680, 681 ; *July 20*, 1368.
Navy—Flogging Regulations, *July 11*, 256, 257.

Hutchinson, Dr. C. F. [Sussex, Rye]
Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 146, 147.

Hyde Park
Carriage Drive, Refuse removed from, Arrangements as to.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 17*, 882.

Hyde Park Corner
Traffic—Obstruction caused by Demonstrators in favour of Unemployed Workmen Bill, in Hyde Park.
Q. Mr Moon; *A.* Mr, A. Douglas, *July 17*, 853.

Hythe Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Income Tax
Roman Catholic Clergy, Payment by.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 20*, 1399.

India
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick.
Under-Secretary—Marquess of Bath.
Army.
Administration.
Papers presented, *July 17*, 804, 850.
Motion of Marquess of Ripon postponed.
Os. Marquess of Ripon, Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 21*, 1513.
Viceroy's Speech in Viceregal Council, Terms of.
Qs. Sir H. Fowler; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 19*, 1175, 1176.
Changes in Organisation of, to be referred to a Mobilisation Committee, proposed.
Os. Marquess of Bath, *July 17*, 806; Mr. Brodrick, 872
Departmental Secretary to the Government of India, granting Local Rank of Major-General to.
Os. Marquess of Bath, *July 17*, 806; Mr. Brodrick, 872.
Reorganisation Proposals of Lord Kitchener, Decision of H.M. Government as to.
Os. Marquess of Ripon, *July 17*, 805; Marquess of Bath, 105-807; Mr. Buchanan, 871; Mr. Brodrick, 871-873.
Bengal, Proposed Partition of, Tabling Papers as to.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 11*, 261.
Calcutta, Government Acquisition of Land—Inconvenience Caused to Traders, etc.
Q. Mr. E. Griffith; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 18*, 1051.

India—*cont.*
Council—Military Member, Duties and *status* of—Decision of H.M. Government.
Os. Marquess of Bath, *July 17*, 806; Mr. Brodrick, 872.
Curzon, Lord, Reported Resignation of.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 10*, 71.
Education of Coolie Class—Reports received.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 11*, 250.
Loans, Railway, *see subheading* Railways.
Pannah, Raja of, Reason for Banishment of, Reply to Petition, etc.
Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 13*, 550, 551.
Press Censorship System, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. O'Dowd, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 11*, 261.
Railways—Loan for Construction, etc. Amount and Objects of.
Os. Mr. Caldwell, *July 18*, 1162, 1163; Mr. Brodrick, 1163.
Bill, *see* East India Loans (Railways) Bill.
Committee to authorise—Resolution reported, *July 18*, 1162.
Viceroy's Council, *see subheading* Council.

Infant Mortality
Feeding of Infants, Ignorance of lower class women as to.
Os. Lord Shuttleworth, *July 20*, 1327, 1328.
Increase in.
Artificial Feeding as a cause, Necessity for Supply of Pure Milk, etc.
Os. Bishop of Ripon, *July 20*, 1309-1311; Lord Kenyon, 1346.
Comparative Rates in Towns and Country Places.
Os. Bishop of Ripon, *July 20*, 1308, 1309; Lord Shuttleworth, 1327.
Measures to Check, Necessity for.
Os. Bishop of Ripon, *July 20*, 1309-1312; Lord Shuttleworth, 1326.
Women Employed in Mills, Factories, etc., Rate of Mortality among Infants of.
Os. Bishop of Ripon, *July 20*, 1309; Lord Shuttleworth, 1332.
Local Inquiries by Local Government Board Inspectors, proposed.
Os. Lord Shuttleworth, *July 20*, 1330, 1331.
Prizes Offered by Mayor of Huddersfield to Parents.
Os. Lord Shuttleworth, *July 20*, 1330.

Inverness Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill
l. 3R., *July 21*, 1498.

Ireland
Lord Lieutenant—Earl of Dudley.
Chief Secretary—Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.
Lord Chancellor—Lord Ashbourne.
Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.
[*For particular places, see their names.*]

Alien Immigration Ports, Decision as to.
O. Capt. Donelan, *July 17*, 874.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 17*, 874.

Boycotting and Intimidation, Prevalence of, Definition of Indirect Intimidation, etc.
Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14*, 693, 713; Lord Clonbrock, 702; Earl of Mayo, 707; Lord Oranmore and Browne, 708; Earl of Arran, 709; Marquess of Londonderry, 712.

Development Grant Fund, Augmentation of — Lord Chancellor's Salary, *see under* Lord Chancellor.

Drainage, Arterial — Commission of Inquiry, Appointment of, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Jno. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1398.
Names, etc., of Commissioners.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 93.
Terms of Reference, etc., Decision as to.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 858.

Foreign Consuls in.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 12*, 403.

Franciscan Manuscripts, Progress made with Printing.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 11*, 250.

Gold Ornaments recently Found in.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 11*, 249, 250.

Gun Licences—Case of J. Devoy at Abbeyleix.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 20*, 1399, 1400.

Horses, *see that title.*

Irish Language, *see that title.*

Iveagh-Pirrie Motor-Car Scheme, Progress made with, Advantages of Route from Galway to Costello, etc.
Os. Lord Killanin, *July 13*, 518-520; Marquess of Londonderry, 520-522.

Libraries, Public, in Rural Districts.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 13*, 538.

Malicious Injury, Definition of.
O. Mr. Flavin, *July 19*, 1184.

Parliamentary Electoral Areas, Redistribution of, *see that title.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Proclaimed Districts in, Date of Proclamation, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 64-66.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. H. Burke, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Field; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 86, 87.

Quit and Crown Rents—Return as to Sums received for Redemption and Purchase since 1897, proposed.
Os. Lord Castletown, Lord Windsor, *July 20*, 1353, 1354.

Redistribution Proposals, Effect of, *see under* Parliamentary Electoral Areas.

Relief of Distress, Expenditure on—Estimate Presented, *July 12*, 379.

Representative Peers, *see under* Parliament—House of Lords.

Threatening Letters, etc., Procedure in Dealing with.
Qs. Mr. Flynn, Mr. J. Devlin; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 19*, 1183, 1184.

Tobacco Cultivation Experiments, Expenditure on, and Progress made with.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 398, 399.
Everard Estate, Result of Experiment on.
Qs. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1396, 1397.

Trade Statistics—Separate Information as to Irish Trade, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Earl Percy, *July 10*, 82, 83; *July 13*, 551.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Lough, Mr. Joyce, Mr. C. Devlin, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. B. Law, *July 20*, 1401, 1402.

Irish Education (Afflicted Children) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 11*, 273.

Irish Language
Postal Orders, Signatures to—Case of Mr. T. O'Heidhin at Castlerea.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 18*, 1076.
Teaching in Schools, Expenditure on, in 1902, 1903, and 1904.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 89.

Iron and Steel
Rhenish Westphalian Mines, Export Bounties Paid by.
Q. Sir T. Wrightson; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 18*, 1048.

Isaacs, Mr. R. D. [Reading]
Aliens Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 951, 973.

Isolation Hospitals
Local Practitioners Attending their own Patients—Regulation as to Payment of Fee when Medical Man is also a Member of the Local Authority.
Q. Sir C. Welby; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 10*, 67.

Italy
Trade Reports Presented, *July 17*, 804; *July 21*, 1500.

Iveagh-Pirrie Motor-Car Scheme
Progress made with, Advantages of Route from Galway to Costello, etc.
Os. Lord Killanin, *July 13*, 518–520; Marquess of Londonderry, 520–522.

James of Hereford, Lord
Convocations of the Clergy Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 724–726.
Emigration—Numbers and Nationalities of Persons leaving the United Kingdom, Wording of Return respecting, *July 11*, 240.
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister—Colonial Marriages, Importance of Legalising, in Great Britain, etc., *July 13*, 524–527.

Jameson, Maj. J. E. [Clare, W.]
Fog Signals—Means of Working and Cost of Syrens on the Coast, *July 17*, 852.

Japan
Treaties as to Leases held in perpetuity—Award of Arbitration Tribunal Presented, *July 19*, 1171; *July 20*, 1298.

Jersey, Earl of
Marshall Islands—German Treatment of British Shipping Trade, *July 13*, 527, 528.

Jessel, Capt. H. M. [St. Pancras, S.]
Serpentine, Bridge over—Reason for Delay in Repairs, *July 20*, 1373.

Joicey, Sir J. [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
Aliens Bill, *Con.*, *July 18*, 1151.

Jones, Mr. D. B. [Swansea District]
Ritualistic Practices Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *July 10*, 96.

Jones, Mr. L. S. [Westmoreland, Appleby]
Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 128; *July 11*, 297, 298, 353; *Con.*, *July 17*, 983–985; *July 18*, 1156.
Canada, Immigrants to, from Continent of Europe, alleged Payment to Shipping Companies for, *July 20*, 1377.
Transvaal.
Chinese Labour Disturbances.
Cost of repressing, Payment of, *July 12*, 392.
Measures taken to cope with, *July 18*, 1060.
Mines—Alleged Cruelty to Native in Croesus Langlaagte, *July 13*, 550.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Limerick.
Crimelessness of, alleged, *July 10*, 87.
Letters for Night Mail, Facilities for posting, at Railway Station, *July 17*, 892.
Money Lending Case, Decision in—Attacks made on Mr. Gaffee by Rev. Mr. Creagh, etc., *July 20*, 1387.
Trade between Ireland and Great Britain, Source of obtaining Information as to, *July 20*, 1402.

Judges
Charges to Juries, Accuracy of Newspaper Reports as to.
O. Mr. H. Burke, *July 17*, 884.

Juvenile Offenders
Courts for, Special, Establishment of, proposed.
Os. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 20*, 1340, 1341.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 13*, 555, 556.
Detention while awaiting Trial, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 20*, 1369.

Juvenile Smoking
Legislation to prevent, proposed.
Os. Earl of Meath, *July 20*, 1325, 1326.

Kearley, Mr. H. E. [Devonport]
Devonport, Overcrowding in, High Rents, etc., *July 12*, 498.
War Office Staff Appointments, Limit of Time for Holding—Reason for Extension to Assistant Adjutant-General, *July 20*, 1374.

Kennedy, Mr. Vincent P. [Cavan, W.]
Cavan Evicted Tenants—Reinstatements effected, *July 17*, 887.
Children, Prevention of Cruelty to—Report of Society, Number of Prosecutions, Nature of Offences, etc., *July 17*, 873.
Coal, Irish Transit Rates on, *July 17*, 858.
Drainage, Arterial, Commission of Inquiry into.
Names, etc., of Commissioners, *July 10*, 93.
Terms of Reference, Decision as to, *July 17*, 858.
Hollesley Bay Labour Colony, Result of Experiments as to, *July 17*, 876.
Hyde Park Carriage Drive, Refuse removed from, *July 17*, 882.
India — Raja of Pannah — Reason for Banishment, etc., *July 13*, 550.
Lisnemaine Evicted Tenant—Reinstatement of P. McConnell, *July 17*, 887.
Unemployed Workmen Bill, Proposals as to taking, *July 17*, 876.

Kenyon, Lord

- Births.
  - Earlier Registration of, proposed, *July 20*, 1347.
  - Still-births, Registration of, *July 20*, 1345.
- Building By-laws, Committee of Inquiry into question of, *July 20*, 1343.
- Food, Standard of Purity, Appointment of Special Inspector to deal with, *July 20*, 1347.
- Houses, Owners of, securing Register of, proposed, *July 20*, 1344.
- Housing, Rural, Powers of District Councils as to, *July 20*, 1347.
- Infant Mortality—Milk Supply, Supervision of, by Local Authorities, *July 20*, 1346.
- Labour Colonies, Inquiry into System of, *July 20*, 1343.
- Medical Officers of Health.
  - Dismissal of, Regulations as to, *July 20*, 1344.
  - Register of Sickness, Desirability of keeping, *July 20*, 1341.
  - Reports from, Regulations as to, *July 20*, 1345.
  - Whole-time Appointments, Question of, *July 20*, 1344.
- Overcrowding, Measures taken to Check, *July 20*, 1342.
- Smoke Pollution, Proposed Increase in Penalties for, *July 20*, 1343, 1344.

Kenyon, Mr. G. T. [Denbigh]

- Redistribution of Electoral Areas—Tabling Explanatory Statement, proposed, *July 10*, 98.
- Treasure Trove, Publication of Laws as to, in Wales, proposed, *July 18*, 1046.

Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W. [Shropshire, Newport]

- Army.
  - Deserters, Punishment of, *July 13*, 671.
  - Feeding Arrangements, Improvement in, *July 13*, 671.
- Volunteers, Extension of Duties of, proposed, *July 13*, 671.

Kerry

- Criminal Cases at Assizes, Condition of County, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 18*, 1074.
- Evicted Tenants—Reinstatements effected.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Murphy, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 94, 95.
  - *Q.* Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 401.

"Kew Bulletin"

- Discontinuance of Publication of, Reason for, Completion of Volume for 1901, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 11*, 245, 246.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]

- Dublin—Trinity College Estates, proposals as to Sale of, *July 20*, 1392.
- Kildare Evictions and Purchase of untenanted Land, Reinstatement of Miss Colgan, etc., *July 12*, 397.
- Land Act, 1903.
  - Uneconomic Holdings, Power of Commissioners to Improve, *July 20*, 1464, 1465.
  - Working of, *July 20*, 1463, 1464.
- Land Judge's Court, Estates in—Return proposed, *July 13*, 563.
- Land Purchase.
  - Estate Sold direct to Tenants—Powers of Commissioner to make Free Grant, *July 20*, 1467, 1469.
  - Evicted Tenants, Funds for reinstatement of, *July 20*, 1465, 1466.
  - Vendors of Estates, Two-thirds of Purchase Money to be taken by, in Stock, and One-third in Cash, proposed, *July 20*, 1466.
- Wicklow and Meath, Purchase of Untenanted Land in, *July 12*, 397.

Kildare

- Evictions—Reinstatement of Miss Colgan.
  - *Q.* Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 397, 398.
- Untenanted Land purchased in.
  - *Q.* Mr. Kilbride; *A* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 397, 398.

Killanin, Lord

- Iveagh-Pirrie Motor Car Scheme, Progress made with, Advantages of Route from Galway to Costello, etc., *July 13*, 518–520.

Kimber, Sir H. [Wandsworth]

- Redistribution Proposals—Boundary Commission, Terms of Reference of, etc., *July 20*, 1403.

Kincardineshire

- Redistribution Proposals, Effect of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Crombie; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 18*, 1082.

King-Harman Estate

- Ancient Monument, Alleged Injury to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Tully; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 11*, 251.
- Grazing Lands, Disposal of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Tully; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 72.
- Rental of Sold and Unsold Portions.
  - *Q.* Mr. Tully; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 14*, 743, 744.

King-Harman Estate—*cont.*
Sale of, Price offered, etc.
Q. Mr. Tully ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 11*, 250.
Advances exceeding £3,000, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Tully ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 14*, 744.
Tenants' Interests, Sanction to Sale of.
Q. Mr. Tully ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 73.
Termon Holding, Decision as to Sale of.
Q. Mr. Tully ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 21*, 1518.
Turbary, Sum advanced for Purchase of.
Q. Mr. Tully ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 73.

King's Lynn
Redistribution Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. F. Wilson, Mr. G. Bowles ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 568, 569.

Knowles, Sir L. [Salford, W.]
Coalfield in Wales, Information as to alleged Purchase of, by German Syndicate, *July 18*, 1054 ; *July 20*, 1383.

"Kyber"
Loss of—Adoption of Suggestions of Court of Inquiry.
Q. Mr. Spear ; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 20*, 1385.

Kyles of Bute
War Office Purchase of Land in.
Qs. Mr. Dobbie ; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 18*, 1056, 1057.

Labour Colonies
Hollesley Bay, Result of Experiment at.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 876, 877.
Inquiry into System of.
O. Lord Kenyon, *July 20*, 1343.

Labour Problem
Inquiry into—Proposals as to employing Services of Mr. R. Haggard.
Q. Sir J. Gorst ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 877.

Labourers' Cottages (Ireland)
Schemes, Failure of Land Act to forward, alleged.
O. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14*, 688.

Lambeg
Postal Vacancy, Appointment of Sligo Postman to.
Q. Mr. C. Craig ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 17*, 856.

Lambert, Mr. G. [Devonshire, South Molton]
Anthrax—Measures taken to cope with Devonshire Outbreak, *July 19*, 1178.
Army.
Condition of—Preparedness for War—Comparison with 1899-1900, *July 19*, 1187.
Recruiting, Effect on, of Reorganisation Proposals, *July 11*, 252.

Lambert, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Crete, British and Foreign Troops in, *July 11*, 249.
Foreign Prison-made Goods—Increase in Amount excluded since Last Statement, *July 21*, 1519.
Militia—Reorganisation Proposals, *July 11*, 252.
Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas.
Boundary Commission.
Appointment of, Procedure as to, *July 18*, 1080.
Payment of, Provision for, *July 17*, 881.
Population Limit proposed, Effect of, *July 20*, 1381.
Amendment proposed, *July 17*, 879.
War Office Finance Branch, Employment of, during South African War, *July 19*, 1175.

Lamont, Mr. N. [Buteshire]
West Indies Mail Service, Arrangements as to, *July 18*, 1065.

Lancaster, Duchy of
Chancellor—Rt. Hon. Sir W. H. Walrond.

Land Act, Ireland, 1903
Connaught, Lack of Success in Land Transactions in, reason for.
Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14*, 689, 698 ; Lord Oranmore and Browne, 707 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 715.
Improvements on Holdings, Powers of Commissioners as to.
O. Mr. Kilbride, *July 20*, 1464, 1465.
Intimidation, Possibility of Estates Commissioners determining use of, Definition of Indirect Intimidation, etc.
Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14*, 693, 713 ; Lord Clonbrock, 702 ; Earl of Mayo, 707 ; Lord Oranmore and Browne, Earl of Arran, 708 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 711 ; Mr. J. Redmond, *July 20*, 1420–1422 ; Mr. Muldoon, 1428, 1429 ; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1433, 1434 ; Mr. Flynn, 1444, 1445 ; Mr. J. Devlin, 1452 ; Mr. Atkinson, 1472, 1473 ; Mr. Clancy, 1475 ; Mr. Long, 1480, 1481.
Landlords, Interests of, upheld to Detriment of those of Tenants, alleged.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 20*, 1434, 1435, 1438 ; Mr. Murphy, 1445, 1446 ; Mr. J. Devlin, 1452, 1453 ; Mr. Lundon, 1457, 1458.
Section 5, Interpretation of.
Q. Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 401.
Untenanted and Grazing Land, Disposal of—Restriction imposed by Regulations.
Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14*, 695 ; Lord Clonbrock, 704 ; Mr. J. Redmond, *July 20*, 1418, 1419, 1422, 1423 ; Mr. Atkinson, 1471, 1472 ; Mr. Clancy, 1475.

[*cont*

Land Act, Ireland 1903—*cont*

Vendors of Estates.

Equality of Treatment between, Necessity for Regulation as to.
Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14*, 691; Marquess of Londonderry, 711.

Two-thirds of Purchase Money to be taken in Stock, and One-third in Cash, proposed.
Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14*, 698, 700; Earl of Mayo, 706; Marquess of Londonderry, 716; Earl of Westmeath, 717; Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1411–1416; Mr. J. Redmond, 1416, 1417, 1425; Col. Saunderson, 1430–1432; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1438, 1439.

Working of—Reasons for Alleged Failure.
Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14*, 687, 713; Lord Clonbrock, 702; Earl of Mayo, 705; Marquess of Londonderry, 710; Earl of Westmeath, 717; Mr. J. Redmond, *July 20*, 1417, 1424; Mr. Muldoon, 1425, 1427–1429; Col. Saunderson, 1429–1432; Mr. Flynn, 1442, 1443; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 1448; Mr. Coghill, 1454, 1455; Sir E. Flower, 1455; Mr. Kilbride, 1463, 1464; Mr. Long, 1481–1483; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1484.

Land Commission, Ireland

Fair-rent Appeals, Progress made in dealing with.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 20*, 1432; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 1449, 1450.

Vote for, *July 20*, 1409, 1459.

Land Judge's Court, Ireland

Delays in.

Financial Measures for dealing with.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A*. Mr. Long, *July 18*, 1071.

Reason for.
O. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14*, 692.

Estates in, Return as to, by Counties, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Kilbride, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As*. Mr. Long, *July 13*, 563, 564.

Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A*. Mr. Long, *July 17*, 888, 889.

Return ordered, *July 17*, 993.

Winding-up of, Breach of Pledge as to, alleged.
O. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 20*, 1436, 1437.

Land Purchase, Ireland

Advances.

Information as to Amount, Rental of Holdings, etc.
Q. Mr. P. White; *A*. Mr. Long, *July 21*, 1518, 1519.

Tenants buying direct from Landlords, Power to add Advance to Purchase Annuity.
Os. Mr. Atkinson, *July 20*, 1468, 1469.

Agreements.

Powers of Estates Commissioners to refuse Approval to, under Section 5 of Act of 1903.
Qs. Mr. Murphy; *As*. Mr. Long, *July 18*, 1074, 1075.

Provisional, Powers of Estates Commissioners as to enquiring into.
Qs. Mr. Murphy, Mr. J. Redmond; *As*. Mr. Long, *July 13*, 564.

Applications:

Method of dealing with—Regulation No. 1.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *July 20*, 1418; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1436; Mr. Atkinson, 1470, 1471; Mr. Clancy, 1475.

Number and Value of.
O. Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1409.

Division of Money made available for each different class of Sales, proposed.
O. Mr. J. Redmond, *July 20*, 1419, 1420.

Estate sold direct to Tenants—Powers of Commissioners to make Free Grant.
Os. Mr. Kilbride, *July 20*, 1467, 1469; Mr. Atkinson, 1468, 1469.

Estates Commissioners.

Ad interim Report, Omissions from.
Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14*, 687.

Confidential Correspondence with, Instructions contained in.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A*. Mr. Long, *July 12*, 400, 401.

Legal Directions, Means of obtaining.
Os. Mr. Atkinson, *July 20*, 1467, 1468.

Legal Question referred to Judicial Commissioners by, Dissenting Commissioner to furnish Reasons for dissenting.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 20*, 1437, 1438, 1474; Mr. Atkinson, 1473, 1474.

Regulations issued to.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *July 20*, 1418.

Authors of.
O. Mr. Clancy, *July 20*, 1474.

Concealment as to, Reasons for Policy of.
Os. Mr. Flynn, *July 20*, 1443

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*
  Estates Commissioners—*cont.*
    Regulations—*cont.*
      Executive, Power of, to interfere with Discretion of Commissioners.
        Os. Mr. Atkinson, *July 20,* 1469, 1470.
      Provisions of.
        Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14,* 687, 713; Lord Clonbrock, 702; Earl of Mayo, 705; Lord Oranmore and Brown, 707; Earl of Arran, 708; Marquess of Londonderry, 710; Earl of Westmeath, 717; Mr. J. Redmond, *July 20,* 1418–1424; Mr. Muldoon, 1425, 1428; Mr. Lundon, 1456.
  Funds available for, Proposals as to.
    Q. Col. Nolan; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 12,* 402, 403.
    Qs. Mr. Lough, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 18,* 1071, 1072.
  Loans, Security for, Farcical Nature of Procedure before Judicial Commissioner.
    Os. Mr. Muldoon, *July 20,* 1426, 1427.
  Mortgages and Gombeen Money-lenders, Influence of.
    Os. Mr. Lundon, *July 20,* 1460, 1461.
  Precedence to Landlords who have dealt fully with Evicted Tenants, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 20,* 1398.
  Price of Land enhanced since Passing of the Act.
    O. Mr. T. P. O'Connor, *July 20,* 1484.
  Sales to Estates Commissioners, Small Number of.
    O. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14,* 692.
  Staff in Dublin, Inadequacy of, alleged.
    Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14,* 698; Earl of Mayo, 707; Marquess of Londonderry, 715; Mr. Russell, *July 20,* 1439.
  Stock, Further Issue of, proposed.
    O. Mr. Long, *July 20,* 1409–1411.
  Town Holdings, Purchase of, Regulations as to, and Power of Commissioners to sanction Purchases.
    Os. Mr. Clancy, *July 20,* 1476; Mr. Field, Mr. Atkinson, 1478.
  Vendors of Estates, Two-thirds of Purchase Money to be taken by, in Stock, and One-third in Cash, proposed.
      Os. Earl of Dunraven, *July 14,* 698, 700; Earl of Mayo, 706; Marquess of Londonderry, 716; Earl of Westmeath, 717; Mr. Long, *July 20,* 1411–1416; Mr. J. Redmond, 1416, 1417, 1425; Col. Saunderson, 1430–1432; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1438, 1439; Mr. Lough, 1440–1442; Sir E. Flower, 1455, 1456; Mr. Kilbride, 1466; Mr. Long, 1479, 1480.

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*
  Vendors of Estates—*cont.*
    Landlords consulted by the Government, alleged.
      Os. Mr. Clancy, *July 20,* 1477, 1478; Mr. Long, 1477–1480.

Lansdowne, Marquess of—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs*
  Emigration—Numbers and Nationalties of Persons leaving the United Kingdom, Wording of Return respecting, *July 11,* 240.
  Government Defeat in the Division Lobbies, Effect of, on House of Lords Business, Position of the Government, etc., *July 21,* 1515, 1516.
  Home Defence.
    Invasion, Possibilities of, *July 10,* 39–43.
    Navy as Sole Means of, Supplementing, by increased Land Defences, proposed, *July 10,* 36–40, 42, 43.
    Raids, Possibility of—Strengthening Land Defences, proposed, *July 10,* 41, 42.
  Indian Army Administration—*Motion* for Papers relating to, postponed, *July 21,* 1513.
  Macedonia, Condition of, Progress made with Reform Schemes, &c., *July 18,* 1030–1039.
  Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, legalising, in the Colonies, &c.—Prospects of Legislation, *July 13,* 526, 527.
  Marshall Islands—German Treatment of British Shipping Trade, *July 13,* 528, 529.
  Morocco, Affairs of—Proposed Conference of French and German Governments—Position of Great Britain, *July 11,* 241.
  Physical Deterioration Committee Recommendations, Carrying into Effect, *July 20,* 1350–1352.
  Russian Cruisers, Seizure and Detention of British Vessels by, Claims dealt with, Probable Date of Settlement, &c., *July 13,* 522, 524.

Laurie, Lt.-Gen. J. W. [Pembroke and Haverfordwest]
  Army, Efficiency of, under New Scheme, Date of making Statement as to, *July 10,* 108.
  Medical Act (1886) Amendment Bill, 3R., *July 18,* 1165.

Law, Mr. A. B. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
  Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company Bill—Provision as to Purchases of Electrical undertakings, *July 18,* 1065, 1066.
  Aliens.
    Arrivals in 1904 as shewn in Board of Trade Returns, *July 17,* 881.
    U S.A., Number prohibited from landing in, during last five years, &c., *July 17,* 882.

Law, Mr. A. B.—*cont.*

Aliens Bill—Cabin and Steerage Passages from Continent, Difference in Cost of, *July 17*, 882.

Channel Tunnel, Proposals as to Proceeding with, *July 20*, 1386.

Coalfield on Whitworth Estate, Alleged Purchase of, by German Syndicate, *July 20*, 1383.

Emigration—Number and Nationality of Passengers to Places out of Europe, Monthly Return as to, proposed, *July 13*, 537; *July 18*, 1048.

Fog Signals—Means of working, and Cost of Syrens round the Coast, *July 17*, 853.

Irish Trade with Great Britain, Separate Statistics as to, proposed, *July 20*, 1402.

Liverpool Dock Strike—Smoking Regulations, Enforcement of, among Imported Labourers, *July 17*, 852.

Merchant Shipping—"Kyber," Loss of—Adoption of Suggestions of Court of Inquiry, *July 20*, 1385.

Railways.

  Footboards on Express Trains from the North, narrowness of, *July 20*, 1385.

  North Eastern—Accidents caused by Live Rails, *July 13*, 554.

  Passengers, Mr. J. Brown's Invention to facilitate taking up and putting down, *July 14*, 742.

Rhenish Westphalian Coal, Iron and Steel Syndicates, Export Bounties paid by, *July 18*, 1048.

Tramway Passengers, Mr. J. Brown's Invention to facilitate taking up and putting down, *July 14*, 742.

Transvaal Company Law—Amalgamation of the Barnato and Johannesburg Consolidated Investment Companies, *July 10*, 84.

Watches as Gold or Silver Plate—Decision in case of Goldsmiths' Company *v.* W. Wyatt, *July 12*, 394.

Weights and Measures Act, 1904, Date of tabling Regulations under, *July 10*, 71.

Law, Mr. H. A. [Donegal, W.]

Dungloe and Burtonport Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *July 12*, 384.

Law Courts

Ireland—High Court of Justice, Probate Division, Accounts (1904) Presented, *July 14*, 686, 736.

Summary Jurisdiction, Courts of—Disposal of Fines.

  Qs. Mr. Scott-Montagu; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 18*, 1061, 1062.

Lawson, Mr. H. [Tower Hamlets, Mile End]

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 135, 136; *July 11*, 355.

Lee, Mr. A. H.—*Lord of the Admiralty* [Hampshire, Fareham]

Chatham Dockyard Extension Works, Estimated Expenditure on, *July 11*, 1197.

Coastguard Service, Estimated Expenditure on, *July 19*, 1197, 1198.

Dockyards.

  Haulbowline, Increasing Amount of repairs at, *July 12*, 486.

  Newhaven, Establishment of Dockyard at, proposed, *July 12*, 485.

  Railway Extension in, Saving effected by, *July 12*, 486.

Loans Bills, Objections to System of, *July 19*, 1198.

Naval Works Bill, Information as to Expenditure under, *July 19*, 1197, 1198.

Rosyth Base, Estimate for Expenditure on, *July 19*, 1197, 1202.

Seamen, Debts of—Regulations as to giving Addresses, etc., to Creditors, *July 17*, 868.

Shipbuilding—Repairs.

  Cost of, comparative, in Government and Private Yards, *July 12*, 484, 485.

  Nucleus Crews, System of—Effect on repairing Work, *July 12*, 485, 486.

Submarines—Salvage Equipment, question of maintaining, in Dockyards, *July 12*, 483, 484.

Theatres, Barrack—Regulations as to Deal, *July 13*, 545.

Wei-hai-wei, Expenditure on Sanatorium at, *July 12*, 483.

Lees, Sir E. [Birkenhead]

National Monuments in Churches, removal of, without Parliamentary Sanction, introduction of Legislation to prevent, *July 19*, 1193, 1195.

Salisbury, late Marquess of, Memorial to, in Westminster Abbey—Objections to Removal of Cornewall Monument, *July 19*, 1193, 1195.

  Drawings relative to, Tabling, proposed, *July 19*, 1181.

Legge, Col. H. [St. George's, Hanover Square]

Big Ben, Face of, Reason for use of Green Light, *July 18*, 1066.

Sewage Disposal Commission, Date of issuing Report of, *July 14*, 740.

Leicestershire

Education Committee, Exclusion of Children under Five Years of Age by—Increase of amount of Grants for Infants, proposed.

  Q. Sir C. McLaren; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 17*, 862, 863.

Leng, Sir J. [Dundee]
- Canadian Cattle, Removal of Restrictions on Importation of, proposed, *July 12*, 391; *July 13*, 553.
- Churches (Scotland) Bill—Placing Government Amendments on Notice paper, *July 10*, 86.
- Dundee, Vaccination Prosecutions in, *July 10*, 69.
- Moroccan Trade and Revision of Provisions of Anglo-French Convention as to, proposed, *July 17*, 861.
- Navy—Submarines.
  - Accidents—Devising Means of Escape for Crew, proposed, *July 20*, 1372.
    - Hatches capable of being Opened in Emergencies, to provide for Escape of Crew, proposed, *July 12*, 385.
  - Extra Men, in addition to Crew, Regulations as to, *July 20*, 1372.
  - Utility of, *July 12*, 380.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 123, 124; *Con.*, *July 17*, 933.
- Emigration of Passengers to Places out of Europe, Monthly Return as to, *July 18*, 1048.

Lewis, Island of
- Sanitary Condition—Report to Local Government Board, Presented, *July 17*, 804, 851.

Lewis, Mr. J. [Flint Boroughs]
- Naval Works Bill, Opportunity for Discussion of, *July 18*, 1084.
- Navy—Obsolete Vessels sold, Names of, Prices realised, &c., *July 18*, 1043, 1053.

Lichfield, Earl of
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 1302.

Lights and Lighthouses
- Syrens, Means of working, Cost of Machinery, &c.
  - *Q.* Major Jameson; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 17*, 852, 853.

Limerick
- Agrarian Outrages in, Persons living under Police Protection, &c.
  - *Qs.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 889-891.
- Money-Lending Case, Decision in—Attacks made on Mr. Gaffee by Rev. Mr. Creagh, &c.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Sloan, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Jno. O'Connor; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 20*, 1386, 1387.
- Postal Arrangements—Letters for Night Mail, Facilities for posting at Railway Station.
  - *Q.* Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 17*, 892.

Linlithgow, Marquess of—*Secretary for Scotland.*
- Dissemination of News previous to Outbreak of War and in Time of War, Government Control over—Japanese Laws, &c., *July 13*, 518.
- Floating Mines in the China Seas, Dangers arising from—Employing H.M. Ships to clear away Mines, proposed, *July 10* 53.
- Navy
  - Dockyards, discharges from—System adopted by the Admiralty, *July 10*, 57, 58.
  - Merchant Cruisers, Value of, as Auxiliaries in time of War—Policy of subsidising, *July 17*, 813, 814.
  - Reserve Forces, Organisation and Training of, *July 17*, 814, 815.
  - "St. Vincent" Training Ship, Information as to Abandonment of, *July 10*, 58.

Liquor Licensing, &c.
- Ireland—Summonses, Procedure in issuing.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. Harrington; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1366.

Lislea
- National School Manager, Appointment of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 11*, 251.

Lisnemaine
- Evicted Tenant—Reinstatement of P. McConnell.
  - *Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 887.

Littlehampton Urban District Council Bill
- *c.* *Rep.** *July 11*, 242.

Liverpool
- Dock Strike—Imported Labourers.
  - Quarters, Alleged Insanitary Condition of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 12*, 380, 381.
  - Smoking, Enforcement of Regulations as to.
    - *Q.* Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 12*, 380.
    - *Q.* Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 17*, 851, 852.
- Liscard Institution, Applications received for training Scotch Boys at.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 18*, 1067.

Liverpool Corporation Bill
- *l.* *Rep.** *July 18*, 1017.

Llandrindod Wells Urban District Council Bill
- *c.* *Con.*,* *July 20*, 1362.

Llewellyn, Mr. E. H. [Somerset, N.]
Coalfield in South Wales, Purchase of by Foreign Syndicate, alleged, *July 12*, 414.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon]
Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1237–1240.
Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1092–1094.
Supply, Allocation of Time to, *July 19*, 1190.

Local Authorities
Accounts, Standardisation of—Proposals as to Appointment of Committee of Inquiry.
Qs. Mr. Cohen; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 20*, 1381.

Local Authorities (Transfer of Treasury Powers) Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read and discharged and Bill withdrawn, *July 17*, 992.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.
Secretary—Mr. J. G. Lawson.
Report, Annual, Presented, *July 12*, 379, *July 13*, 511.
Status of, Proposals as to Improving.
Qs. Mr. L. Sinclair; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 101; *July 20*, 1403.

Local Government Board (Ireland)
Law Adviser, Appointment of Assistant to.
Q. Mr. Muldoon; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 885.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 14*, 735.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 17*, 849.
l. 1R.* *July 17*, 803.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
l. *Com.** *July 10*, 2.
3R.* *July 11*, 215.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
l. *Com.** and *Rep.** *July 14*, 685.
3R.* *July 17*, 803.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 11*, 242.
*Con.** *July 12*, 377.
3R. *July 13*, 530.
l. 1R.* *July 14*, 685.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 12*, 377.
*Con.** *July 13*, 530.
3R.* *July 14*, 735.
l. 1R.* *July 14*, 685.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 16) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 17*, 803.
*Com.** *July 18*, 1018.
3R.* *July 20*, 1298.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 17) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 17*, 803.
*Com.** *July 18*, 1018.
3R.* *July 20*, 1298.

Local Government Provisional Order Poor Law (No. 2) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 18*, 1041.
*Con.** *July 19*, 1169.
3R.* *July 20*, 1363.
l. 1R.* *July 20*, 1297.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
Dogs, Cruelty of throwing, into the Thames, alleged—Police Powers of Interference, etc., *July 13*, 536; *July 17*, 875.
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, Withdrawal of, proposed, *July 10*, 109.

London
Chamberlain's Accounts (1904) Presented, *July 21*, 1500, 1517.
Street Traffic Commission Report, Date of issuing.
Q. Sir G. Bartley; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 11*, 262.

London and North Western Railway Bill
l. *Rep.** *July 11*, 214.
3R.* *July 17*, 802.

London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill.
c. *Rep.** *July 14*, 735.
Standing Orders 84, 214 and 239, *Motion* for suspending, Objection to.
Os. Mr. C. Macdona, Mr. Bailey, Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 1170.

London County Council (Money) Bill
l. *Rep.** *July 20*, 1297.

London County Council (Tramways) Bill

c. 3R.* *July 12*, 377.

l. 1R.* *July 13*, 510.

2R., *July 18*, 997.

Second Reading postponed for Three Months, 1017.

Os. Lord Newton, *July 17*, 803; Earl of Onslow, 804.

Debate on Motion [Vis. Ridley], *July 18*, 997.

Embankment, Objections to converting, into a Tram-car Route, 999, 1005–1007, 1015.

Extension of Powers of London County Council, Objections to, 1012–1014.

Former Attempts to bring Tramways across Bridges, 997, 998.

Incompleteness of the Measure, 1000, 1001, 1004, 1011, 1012.

Instruction to Committee, Moving of, not possible until the Bill read a Second Time, 1016.

Linking up of North and South Tramway Systems not accomplished by the Bill, 1000, 1008, 1010.

Local Authorities in favour of the Scheme, alleged, 1002, 1009, 1011.

Objections to the Bill, 998.

Standing Order No. 13, Breach of, by Promoters of the Bill, 999.

Traffic Commission, Report and Recommendations of, 1003, 1004, 1008, 1010, 1012.

Traffic over Bridges, Objections to Interference with, 998, 999, 1007, 1008, 1013.

Traffic System, Objections to further complicating, 1001, 1013.

Unnecessary Nature of Proposals, alleged, 1000, 1007–1009, 1015.

Unprecedented Character of *motion* for Rejection of Bill, alleged, 1002, 1003, 1005, 1006, 1012.

Westminster and Blackfriars Bridges, Proposal to bring Tramways across, 997–1000, 1010.

London Gas Bill

l. 3R.* *July 20*, 1297.

London Government Scheme (Hackney and Edmonton Unions) Bill

l. 2R.* *July 21*, 1498.

London Government Scheme (London and Middlesex) Bill.

l. 2R.* *July 21*, 1498.

Londonderry, Marquess of—*Lord President of the Council, and President of the Board of Education*

Cookery and Domestic Hygiene, Facilities for Training in, *July 20*, 1338.

Horses suffering from Epizootic Lymphangitis, Measures taken to enforce Regulations laid down by Circular of 1904, etc., *July 11*, 222–224, 226, 227.

Names of Military Centres from which Disease spread, Return as to, proposed, *July 17*, 843, 844.

Infants.

Attendance of, under Five Years of Age, to be optional, *July 20*, 1339.

Schools, Inquiry into Methods Employed in, *July 20*, 1338,

Iveagh-Pirrie Motor-car Scheme, Progress made with, Advantages of route from Galway to Costello, etc., *July 13*, 520–522.

Juvenile Offenders, Establishment of Special Courts for, proposed, *July 20*, 1340–1341.

Land Act 1903, Working of, Reason for Alleged Failure, etc, *July 14*, 710.

Physical Deterioration.

Anthropometric Survey to collect *data* as to, Institution of, proposed, *July 20*, 1334–1336, 1348.

Inter-departmental Committee on, Measures proposed for carrying into effect, *July 20*, 1334, 1336–1341.

Origin of Appointment, and Terms of Reference, *July 20*, 1333, 1334.

Public Roads (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 21*, 1513.

Rural Education, Improvement in System of, Measures taken as to, *July 20*, 1337.

Schools.

Infant, Enquiry into Methods employed in, *July 20*, 1338.

Retarded Children, for, Establishment of, *July 20*, 1338.

Women, Employment of, after Child-birth—Difficulty of enforcing Legislation, *July 20*, 1340.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Bristol, S.]

Abbeyfeale, Land purchase in, Information as to, *July 17*, 889.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department.

Funds, Surplus, Allocation of, Ulster Claims, etc., *July 10*, 88.

Officials, Information as to Names, Duties, etc., proposed, *July 19*, 1173.

Promotions, Inquiry into System of, proposed, *July 10*, 75.

[*cont.*

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*cont.*
- Agriculture etc.—*cont.*
  - Veterinary Branch Clerks, Salaries of, *July 17*, 886.
- Armagh Licenced Premises, Regulations as to display of Flags on, *July 10* 92.
- Armstrong Estate Untenanted Lands, Disposal of, *July 17*, 857.
- Bail—Security for Appearance of Man under his own Recognisances *July 12*, 400.
- Ballyphilip, malicious Injury to Bull at, Efforts made to trace Perpetrator, etc., *July 10*, 90.
- Belfast—Dundonald Cemetery Regulations and Roman Catholic Claim as to Discretionary Authority, *July 20*, 1390.
- Blennerhassett Estate—Reinstatement of W. O'Neill and B. Sheehy, *July 20*, 1392.
- Boyle—Information as to Disturbance at House of Mr. Magennis, Arrests effected, etc., *July 18*, 1073, 1074.
- Camp—Purchase of Estate of Mr. F. Day, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, etc., *July 20*, 1367.
- Clew Bay Islands, Disposal of Grazing Lands on, *July 10*. 74.
- Coal, Transit Rates on, *July 17* 858.
- Coalisland.
  - Disturbance at House of Mr. Harkin, Efforts made to trace Offenders, etc., *July 20*, 1391.
  - McManus, J., Reason for summoning, *July 20*, 1390.
- Constabulary, Royal Irish.
  - Cryan, Constable, Information as to, *July 12*, 400.
  - Dunphy, Sergeant, and Constable Daly, Charges against, and Present Employment of, *July 13*, 566, 567.
  - Finnigan, Constable, Reason for Transfer of, *July 20*, 1390.
  - Masterson, Constable, Charge against, in Carroll Case, Warrant for arrest, etc.
    - Absconding before Assizes, *July 10*, 894 ; *July 17*, 885, 886.
      - Date of Disappearance, etc., *July 12*, 399, 400.
    - Payment of Costs, etc., given against, *July 12*, 400.
    - Trial, Tabling Judge's Notes, etc., used in, proposed, *July 20*, 1393.
  - Truncheon, Instructions as to use of, *July 17*, 884 ; *July 20*, 1393.
- Cork County, Condition of, as to Cases of Intimidation, etc., *July 19*, 1183, 1184.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*cont.*
- Cragg & Ardcrone Farms, Acquisition and Disposal of, *July 18*, 1072, 1073.
- Croker Estate Purchase Negotiations, Reinstatement of Mr. M. Power, etc., *July 12*, 397.
- Customs and Excise Duties, Allocation of Irish Share of, *July 19*, 1173.
- Derry McEdmond Estate, Decision as to Mr. Frend, *July 10*, 88.
- Derrycroff Bridge, Erection of, proposed, *July 20*, 1374.
- Drainage, Arterial, Commission of Inquiry into.
  - Appointment of, Proposals as to, *July 20*, 1398.
  - Names, etc, of Commissioners, *July 10*, 93.
  - Terms of Reference, Decision as to, *July 17*, 858.
- Dublin.
  - Metropolitan Police.
    - Report, Annual, Delay in issuing, *July 17*, 888.
    - Station-Sergeants, Wearing of Number on Collar by, proposed, *July 17*, 866.
  - Trinity College Estates, Proposals as to Sale of, *July 20*, 1391, 1392.
- Dunnes Minors Estate Evicted Tenant Talbot, Reinstatement of, *July 18*, 1070.
- Education.
  - Afflicted Children, Source of Grant for, *July 20*, 1399.
  - Banogue School Arrangements, Authority for, *July 12*, 396.
  - Dublin—Marlborough Street Training College, Male Students in (1902–1905), *July 12*, 397.
  - Dublin Office, Promotions in, *July 10*, 72.
  - Extra Subjects, Fees paid for—Modification of Circular, *July 13*, 537.
  - Kindergarten—Regulations for Teaching and Training of Teachers, *July 12*, 395.
  - Lislea National School Manager, Appointment of, *July 11*, 251.
  - National School Teachers.
    - English Teachers employed in Irish Schools, *July 12*, 397.
    - Political Discussion at Meetings, Tabling Circular, as to, etc., *July 10*, 90.
    - Salaries under New Rules, *July 20*, 1397, 1398.
      - Salaries of 1 (1) Class under New Code, *July 13*, 537.

[*cont.*

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*cont.*

- Education—*cont.*
  - Rule 127 (*b*).
    - Commissioners dissenting from, at Meeting, Tabling Protest of, *July 19*, 1185.
    - Reason for making, *July 12*, 396
  - Rules, Procedure in making and revising, *July 19*, 1185.
  - Schools.
    - Amalgamation of Boys' and Girls' Schools, Objection of Roman Catholic Bishops to, *July 17*, 888 ; *July 20*, 1396.
    - Mixed Schools under a Master, Provision of Female Teacher, *July 12*, 396.
- Eviction Reinstatements.
  - Cavan, Reinstatements Effected in, *July 17*, 887.
  - Estates Commissioners.
    - Powers of, under New Regulations, *July 13*, 565.
    - Reinstatements Effected by, *July 17*, 888.
  - Lisnemaine—Reinstatement of P. McConnell, *July 17*, 887.
  - Unoccupied Farm forming Portion of Estate, Powers of Estate Commissioners to define as an Estate, for Reinstatement Purposes, *July 11*, 267.
  - Waterford, Number of Applications for Reinstatement received from, *July 10*, 72.
- Fisheries—Motor Fishing-boat, Experiments as to, proposed, *July 18*, 1068.
- Floughena, O'Connor Estate—Provision for Reinstatement of Children of late T. Durkan, *July 17*, 857.
- French, Maj., Estate of—Disposal of Grazing Lands, *July 20*, 1389.
- Galway Jurors, Special, Qualifications of, *July 10*, 95, 96.
- Gortfada—Efforts made by Police to find missing Sheep of M. O'Connor, *July 19*, 1173.
- Horses.
  - Breeding Schemes—Encouragement of Breeding of Carriage Horses proposed, *July 12*, 398.
  - Epizootic Lymphangitis outbreak.
    - Measures taken to eradicate Disease, *July 13*, 539.
    - Waterford Horses, Restrictions on Movement of, *July 13*, 540.
- Irish Language, Teaching, in Schools, Expenditure on (1902–1904), *July 10*, 89.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*cont.*

- Kerry.
  - Criminal Cases at Assizes, Condition of County, etc., *July 18*, 1074.
  - Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of, *July 10*, 94, 95 ; *July 12*, 401.
- Kildare — Purchase of Untenanted Land, Reinstatement of Miss Colgan, etc., *July 12*, 398.
- King-Harman Estate.
  - Ancient Monument, alleged Injury to, *July 11*, 251.
  - Rental of Sold and Unsold Portions, *July 14*, 744.
  - Sale of, Price offered, etc., *July 11*, 250
    - Advances exceeding £3,000, Information as to, *July 14*, 744.
  - Termon Holding, Decision as to Sale of *July 21*, 1518.
  - Turbary and Grazing Lands, Disposal of, Sanction of Commissioners to Sale of Tenants' Interest, etc., *July 10*, 72, 73.
- Land Act, 1903.
  - Confidential Correspondence with Estates Commissioners, Instructions contained in, *July 12*, 401.
  - Funds, Proposals for augmenting, *July 18*, 1071, 1072.
  - Section 5, Interpretation of, *July 12*, 401.
  - Working of, *July 20*, 1481-1483.
- Land Judge's Court.
  - Delays in, Proposals as to dealing with, *July 18*, 1071.
  - Estates in—Return proposed, *July 13*, 563, 564 ; *July 17*, 888.
- Land Purchase.
  - Advances applied for under Act of 1903, Information as to, *July 21*, 1519.
  - Agreements.
    - Powers of Estates Commissioners to refuse Approval to, *July 18*, 1075.
    - Provisional, Powers of Estates Commissioners as to Inquiry into, *July 13*, 564.
  - Applications, Number and Value of, *July 20*, 1409.
  - Evicted Tenants, Effect of New Regulations on Reinstatement of, *July 20*, 1482.
  - Intimidation, Regulations as to dealing with, *July 20*, 1480, 1481.
  - Precedence to Landlords who have dealt fully with Evicted Tenants, proposed, *July 20*, 1398.

[*cont.*

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*cont.*

- Land Purchase—*cont.*
  - Stock, Further issue of, proposed, *July 20*, 1409-1411.
  - Untenanted Land purchased in Wicklow and Meath, *July 12*, 398.
  - Vendors of Estates, Two-thirds of Purchase Money to be taken by, in Stock, and one-third in Cash, proposed, *July 20*, 1411-1416, 1479, 1480.
    - Landlords consulted by the Government, alleged, *July 20*, 1477-1480.
- Libraries, Public, in Rural Districts, *July 13*, 538.
- Limerick, Agrarian Outrages in—Persons living under Police Protection, *July 17*, 889-891.
- Liquor Licensing—Summonses, Procedure in issuing, *July 20*, 1366.
- Local Government Board—Law Adviser, appointment of Assistant to, *July 17*, 885.
- Lord Chancellor, Proposed Reduction in Salary of, date of coming into operation, etc., *July 17*, 885.
- Luggacurran, Reinstatements effected on, Case of Mr. Byrne, etc., *July 18*, 1070, 1071.
- McFarlane Estate, Sale of, Decision as to Sporting Rights, etc., *July 20*, 1394, 1395.
- Magistrates—Mr. Kelly, Appointment of, Action of Lord Chancellor as to Speeches made some time previous to election, etc., *July 10*, 90, 91.
- Mayberry, F. G., Estate of—Progress of Negotiations for Sale, *July 10*, 88.
- Netterville Estate — Purchase and Disposal of Woodbrook Farm, *July 19*, 1182.
- O'Donell Estate—Progress of Negotiations for Sale of, *July 10*, 74.
- Piers—Poulduff Pier Works, Decision as to, *July 11*, 251.
- Poor Law Reform Commission, Date of Issuing Report of, *July 10*, 75.
  - Local Inquiries remaining to be made, etc., *July 18*, 1073.
- Proclaimed Districts, Number of, etc., *July 10*, 66, 86, 87.
- Sandes Estate—Sale of, and Proposals for Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, *July 20*, 1394.
- Sneem.
  - Dog-poisoning Cases, Measures taken to Trace Offenders, etc., *July 11*, 267.
  - Steamer Service — Decision as to Memorial from Residents in District, *July 19*, 1182.
  - Warden, Col., Reason for Alleged Police Protection of, *July 20*, 1389.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*cont.*

- Threatening Letters—Procedure in Dealing with, etc., *July 19*, 1183, 1184.
- Tobacco Cultivation Experiments, Expenditure on, and Progress made with, *July 12*, 399.
  - Everard Estate—Result of Experiment on, *July 20*, 1397.
- Trenche, Mr. O'H., Sale of Estate of—Powers of Estates Commissioners to intervene, *July 19*, 1183.
- Wallis Estate—Application for Reinstatement of Mr. T. O'Keeffe, *July 10*, 92.
- Waterford Evicted Tenants—Negotiations for Reinstatement of, *July 10*, 93; *July 13*, 539.
  - Blackditches Farm — Reinstatement Application of Mrs. Cullen, *July 18*, 1072.
- Westport Floods, Cause and Prevention of, *July 13*, 538.
- Wicklow Evicted Tenants, Applications from, and Reinstatements effected, *July 18*, 1070.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]

- Horse-breeding Schemes—Encouragement of Carriage-horse Breeding proposed, *July 12*, 398.
- Land Judge's Court—Delays in, Financial Measures for dealing with, *July 18*, 1071.
- Lislea National School Manager, Appointment of, *July 11*, 251.

Lord-Advocate for Scotland

Rt. Hon. C. Scott Dickson.

Lord Chancellor

Earl of Halsbury.

- Resignation of, Rumours as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Dalziel, *July 17*, 993, 994.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland

Lord Ashbourne.

- Salary of — Reduction proposed under Development Grant Bill, Expediting coming into operation.
  - *Q.* Mr. Muldoon; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 884, 885.

Lord Chief Justice

Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain

Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland

Earl Dudley.

Lord President of the Privy Council

Marquess of Londonderry.

Lord Privy Seal

Marquess of Salisbury.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, West.]
- Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company Bill.
  - Committee.
    - Members of, Voting on Second Reading, Appointment of Members financially interested, etc., *July 11*, 271, 272.
    - Power to sit while Motion against Appointment was on Agenda, *July 12*, 378.
  - Passing into Law this Session, Possibility of, *July 18*, 1076, 1077.
  - Purchase of Electrical Undertakings Provision as to *July 18*, 1065, 1066.
- Aliens Bill, *con.*, *July 17*, 912.
  - Expenses, Limiting, proposed, *July 11*, 277, 278.
- Big Ben, Saving effected by illuminating, with Green Light, etc., *July 18*, 1067; *July 20*, 1386.
- Bordon Military Camp—Sewage Disposal, *July 13*, 546.
- Chicory, Information as to, *July 19*, 1177.
- Land Act, 1903—Funds, Proposals for augmenting, *July 18*, 1071, 1072.
- Land Purchase, Ireland — Vendors of Estates, two-thirds of Purchase Money to be taken by, in Stock, and one-third in Cash, proposed, *July 20*, 1440–1442.
- Navy Loans Bills, Objections to System of, *July 19*, 1206.
- Supply, Allocation of Time to, July *19*, 1189.
- Supply of Electricity Bill, Proposals as to taking, *July 18*, 1076, 1077.
- Trade and Commerce — Authority necessary for separate Statistics as to Irish Trade with Great Britain, *July 20*, 1402.
- Unemployed Workmen Bill, Possibility of passing into Law this Session, *July 12*, 508; *July 13*, 571.

Loughrea
- Magistracy—Appointment of Mr. Kelly—Action of Lord Chancellor as to Speeches made some Time before Election.
  - *Qs.* Mr. C. Craig, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Long, Mr. Speaker, *July 10*, 90, 91.

Lourenço Marques
- Trade Report Presented, *July 17*, 804.

Lovat, Lord
- Yeomanry.
  - Classes and Lectures for Senior Officers, Establishment of, proposed, *July 17*, 828, 829.
  - Horsing of, In Cases of emergency, Tabling Papers as to, proposed, *July 17*, 830.
  - Mobilisation of, Arrangements for, *July 17*, 827, 829.
  - Musketry and Signalling Schools, Establishment of, proposed, *July 17*, 828.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W. [Cumberland, Penrith]
- *See* Speaker.

Loyd, Mr. A. K. [Berkshire, Abingdon]
- Swine Fever.
  - Investigation into Causes and Symptoms—Date of Presenting Report, *11*, 248.
  - Outbreaks—Comparison of 1903 and 1904, *July 11*, 247.

Lucas, Col. F. A. [Suffolk, Lowestoft]
- Coalfield on Whitworth Estate, alleged Purchase of, by German Syndicate, *July 20*, 1383.

Lucas, Mr. R. J. [Portsmouth]
- Militia Re-organisation Proposals, Opportunity for discussing, *July 11*, 267.
- Navy.
  - Belleville Boilers, Advantages of, *July 12*, 474.
  - Manœuvres, Publication of Results of, proposed, *July 12*, 473.
  - Marines, Royal—Age limit for Major-Generals, *July 11*, 247.
  - Salvage Work of the Fleet, developing, proposed, *July 12*, 474.
- Portsmouth Dockyard Discharges—Assistance to Workmen to Emigrate, proposed, *July 14*, 738.
- Wei-hai-wei, Expenditure on, Information as to, *July 12*, 472.

Ludlow, Lord
- Drunkenness (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 845, 846.
- Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies) Bill, 2R, *July 11*, 216–219; *Com.*, *July 17*, 847, 848.

Luggacurran
- Evicted Tenants, Re-instatement of, Decision in case of Mr. Byrne, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Delany, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Long, Mr. Speaker, *July 18*, 1070, 1071.

Lunacy Bill
- *c.* Order for Second Reading read and discharged and Bill withdrawn, *July 18*, 1164.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
- Banogue National School Arrangements, Authority for, *July 12*, 396.
- Croker Estate purchase Negotiations, Re-instatement of Mr. M. Power, etc., *July 12*, 396.
- Education.
  - Mixed Schools under a Master, Provision of Female Teacher for, *July 12*, 395.
  - Rule 127 (*b*), Reason for making, *July 12*, 395.
- Land Act, 1903—Landlords, Interests of, predominant, *July 20*, 1457, 1458.

[*cont.*

Lundon, Mr. W.—*cont.*
- Land Purchase.
  - Evicted Tenants, Delay in Re-instatement of, *July 20*, 1460–1462.
  - Mortgagees and Gombeen Money-lenders, influence of, *July 20*, 1460, 1461.
  - Regulations issued to Estates Commissioners, *July 20*, 1456.

Lyell, Mr. C. H. [Dorset, E.]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 116, 117, 128.
- Macedonia.
  - Financial Control System, Proposed, Decision of Turkish Government as to, *July 20*, 1377.
  - Zervi Village—Outrages by Turkish Soldiers, Measures taken to punish Offenders, etc., *July 13*, 552.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A.—*Secretary of State for the Colonies* [Warwick and Leamington]
- Africa, East—Zionists, Offer of Territory to—Tabling Papers proposed, *July 11*, 260; *July 13*, 549.
- Canada.
  - Cattle Trade, Removal of Restrictions on, proposed, *July 12*, 392.
  - Garrisons at Halifax and Esquimault, Decision as to, Tabling Correspondence, etc., *July 20*, 1367.
  - Quebec—Tax imposed on Commercial Travellers, etc., for Firms outside Canada, *July 17*, 862.
- Cape Colony.
  - Convict Labour System, Information as to, *July 10*, 62.
  - Wine, Preferential Treatment for, proposed, *July 17*, 859.
- Ceylon.
  - Debt, Regulations as to Imprisonment for, *July 17*, 858.
  - Education of Coolie Children, Date of Presenting Committee Report on, *July 20*, 1374.
- Dominica — Decision in case of Mr. W. Davies, *July 13*, 540.
- Nigeria, Northern—Decision as to Railways, *July 13*, 548.
- South African War Stores, etc.,—Documents Destroyed to prevent Plague, Information as to, *July 20*, 1367.
- Transvaal.
  - Chinese Labour.
    - Attacks on White Population, alleged, *July 13*, 547.
    - Disturbances.
      - Cost of Repressing, Payment of, *July 12*, 392.
      - Measures taken to cope with, *July 18*, 1060.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Transvaal—*cont.*
  - Chinese Labour—*cont.*
    - Flogging Regulations, *July 18*, 1060, 1061.
    - Prisons, Number in, Nature of Offences, etc., *July 18*, 1059.
    - Punishments, Authority for inflicting, *July 13*, 548, 549.
    - Repatriations, Number and Causes of, *July 18*, 1059.
  - Company Law, Amendments of, *July 10*, 82.
  - Mines.
    - Crœsus, Langlaagte.
      - Cruelty to Native in, alleged, *July 13*, 550.
      - Illegal Flogging on, alleged, *July 18*, 1060.
    - Good Friday Labour in Jumpers Deep, Prosecution of Europeans for, *July 11*, 260.
    - Labour, White and Coloured, employed in, *July 13*, 541.
  - Treasurer, amount owing to, by Mr. Van Rensburg, Cabling for Information, etc., *July 11*, 258, 259; *July 18*, 1058, 1059.
  - War Contribution Loan, Payment of, Allocation of Revenue from Premier Diamond Mine, etc., *July 12*, 393.
- Uganda—Mr. Galt, Information as to Murder of, *July 11*, 260.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Exchange]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 291; *Con.*, *July 17*, 909–911.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, E.]
- Army Shooting—Measures taken to attain Standard of Efficiency, *July 13*, 546.
- Volunteers.
  - Army Service Corps for, Proposals as to Establishment of, *July 13*, 587.
  - Circular from the War Office, asking Commanding Officers to report as to Efficiency of Corps, etc., *July 13*, 580–583.
    - Withdrawal of, proposed, *July 13*, 587.
  - Division of, into two Classes, proposed, *July 13*, 584, 586.
  - Medical Examination of, Compulsory Nature of, *July 17*, 871.
  - Reduction in Number of, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 583, 586.
  - Reorganisation Proposals, *July 13*, 580.
  - Shooting.
    - "First-class Shot," Definition of, *July 10*, 79.
    - Standard of Efficiency, *July 13*, 542, 546, 583; *July 17*, 869.

Macdona, Mr. J. C. [Southwark, Rotherhithe]
- London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill, *Motion* for Suspension of Standing Orders, Objections to, *July 19*, 1170.
- Navy Dockyards—Newhaven, Establishment of Dockyard at, proposed, *July 12*, 485.
- Wei-hai-wei, Advantages of, as a Naval Base and Sanatorium, *July 12*, 478, 479.

Macedonia
- *Debate* [Lords], *July 18*, 1020.
  - Adrianople Vilayet, Inclusion of, in New Scheme of Reform, proposed, 1025.
  - Austria, Inability of, to deal with the Situation, 1020, 1021, 1023, 1026.
  - Bashi-Bazouks, Employment of, by Turks, Contravention of Agreement as to, 1033.
  - British Government, Responsibility of, 1029, 1038.
  - Civil Agents, Dispensing with Services of, proposed, 1024, 1025, 1035, 1036, 1038.
  - Condition of, Menace to the Peace of Europe, etc., 1026, 1028, 1030, 1031.
  - Financial Reforms.
    - Austro-Russian Scheme, 1024, 1035.
    - Customs Duties, Proposed Increase in, 1034, 1035.
    - International Control, Proposals as to, 1025, 1036, 1037.
      - British Representative, Information as to, 1039.
      - Note presented by the Powers to the Porte, Terms of, 1036.
      - Sultan, Refusal of, to accede to, 1027, 1037.
    - Turkish Proposals, 1034, 1035.
  - *Gendarmerie*, Re-organisation of, under European Officers.
    - Administrative Success of the Scheme, 1022, 1023, 1026, 1033.
    - Details and Progress of the Scheme, 1033, 1034.
    - Mauser Rifle, Arming of the Force with, 1034.
    - Turkish Officers of, Improvement in *status* of, 1034.
  - Kuklitch, Outrages at, Information as to, 1027, 1031, 1032.
  - Papers relating to, Further, Tabling, proposed, 1039.
  - Reforms.
    - Adrianople Vilayet, Inclusion of, proposed, 1025.

Macedonia—*cont.*
- *Debate* [Lords]—*cont.*
  - Reforms—*cont.*
    - Austro-Russian Scheme, Failure of, 1020, 1023, 1026, 1032.
    - Financial, *see sub-heading* Financial Reforms.
    - Mürzsteg Scheme, Failure of, 1032.
    - Progress made with, 1020, 1021, 1030.
  - Russia, Inability of, to deal with the Situation, 1020, 1021, 1023, 1026
  - Tithe Collection, Alteration in System of, 1032, 1033.
  - Turkey.
    - Customs Duties, Proposed Increase in, 1034, 1035.
    - Responsibility of, 1021.
- Adrianople Refugees in Bulgaria, Information as to.
  Q. Sir A. Hayter; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 13*, 535.
- Financial Control—Decision of Turkish Government as to System proposed by the Powers.
  Qs. Mr. Lyell, Capt. Ellice; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 20*, 1377, 1378.
- Reforms—Mürzsteg Programme—Exemption of burnt Christian Villages from one year's Taxation.
  Q. Mr. C. Allen; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 19*, 1172.
- Zervi Village, Outrages of Turkish Soldiers at—Measures taken to Punish Offenders, etc.
  Q. Mr. Lyell; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 13*, 552.

McFadden, Mr. E. [Donegal, E.]
- Seamen, Debts of — Regulations as to giving Addresses, etc., to Creditors, *July 17*, 868.

McFarlane Estate
- Sale of—Decision as to Sporting Rights, etc.
  Qs. Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Delany. *As.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1394, 1395.

McIver, Mr. D. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 298, 345; *Con.*, *July 17*, 933.
  - Expenses — Estimated Cost of Administering the Act, *July 11*, 281.

McIver, Sir L. [Edinburgh, W.]
- Edinburgh — King's Park — Reason for Closing Upper Road to Motors, *July 13*, 535.

McKenna, Mr. R. [Monmouth, N.]
East Ham Refusal to Administer Education Act—Government Proposals as to Legislation, *July 17*, 866.
Government Defeat—Adjournment of the House till Monday, proposed, *July 20*, 1494.
Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas—Boundary Commission, Constitution and Terms of Reference of, *July 20*, 1404-1406.

McLaren, Sir C. B. Bright [Leicester, Bosworth]
Leicestershire Education Committee, Exclusion by, of Children under Five Years of age—Amount of Grants, etc., *July 17*, 862.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
Civil Servants, Pay of—Proposals as to Parliamentary Advisory Committee, *July 13*, 554.
Education Vote, Date of Taking, *July 12*, 385.
Post Office Wages—Political Pressure by Postal Staff to obtain Increase of Pay, Postmaster-General's Statement as to, *July 18*, 1062, 1063.
Public Accounts Committee Report, Opportunity for Discussing, *July 13*, 567, 568.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour.
 Attacks on White Population, alleged, Information as to, *July 13*, 547.
 Flogging Regulations, *July 18*, 1060, 1061.

McNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal S.]
Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 351, 352.
Constabulary, R.I.—Masterson and Cryan, Trial of, Precedent for Tabling Judge's Notes used in, *July 20*, 1393.
Galway Special Jurors, Qualifications of, *July 10*, 96.
Redistribution of Electoral Areas.
 Boundary Commission, Appointment of, *July 20*, 1406.
 Explanatory Statement, Tabling, proposed, *July 10*, 99.
Questions Unanswered.
 Prime Minister — Position on the Paper of Questions addressed to—Number remaining Unanswered, etc., *July 20*, 1407.
 Rules as to Circulation with the Votes, *July 11*, 269, 270.

Maconochie, Mr. A. W. [Aberdeenshire, East]
Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1121.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, South]
Act of Union, Irish Parliamentary Representation under, *July 17*, 893, 896; *July 18*, 1080, 1081.
Down, South, Redistribution Proposals as to, *July 18*, 1083.
Education.
 Marlborough Street Training College, Male Students in (1902-1905), *July 12*, 397.
 National School Teachers — English Teachers employed in Irish Schools, *July 12*, 397.
Hazelgrove Disturbances, Information as to, *July 11*, 263.
India — Raja of Pannah — Reason for Banishment, etc., *July 13*, 551.
Police, Metropolitan, Injuries caused to, while on duty, Compensation awarded, etc., *July 13*, 559.
Post Office.
 Leave, Annual, to Officers about to retire, Regulations as to, *July 14*, 741.
 Postmen, Assistant and Auxiliary, Conditions of Employment of, *July 14*, 741.
Questions, Alterations in, at the Table—Rules as to Communicating with Members, *July 13*, 557.
Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas—Representation of Ireland.
 Act of Union, under, *July 17*, 893, 896; *July 18*, 1080, 1081.
 Northcote, late Sir S., and late Marquess of Salisbury, Opinions of, in 1884, *July 19*, 1185.
South African War Stores, etc.—Documents destroyed to Prevent Plague, Information as to, *July 20*, 1367.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace
Ireland — Mr. Kelly, Appointment of, Action of Lord Chancellor as to Speeches made some time previous to Election, &c.
 Qs. Mr. C. Craig, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Long, Mr. Speaker, *July 10*, 90, 91.

Malta
Fever, Origin of, and Number of Men invalided by (1895-1905).
 Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 20*, 1371, 1372.

Malvern Water Bill
l. 2R.* *July 11*, 214.

Mansfield Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Marines, Royal
See under Navy.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Notts, Mansfield]

Aliens Bill, *Com. July 11*, 325, 341.

Coalfield in South Wales, Purchase of, by Foreign Syndicate, alleged, *July 12*, 414; *July 20*, 1384.

Divisions—Delay of Opposition Members in Proceeding to the Lobby, *July 11*, 325, 326.

Transvaal — Chinese Labour — Flogging Regulations, *July 18*, 1061.

Marks, Mr. H. H. [Kent, Thanet]

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 117–119; *July 11*, 339–341, 343; *Con.*, *July 17*, 927.

Army.

Long Service Men available for Indian and Foreign Drafts, *July 11*, 256.

Officers—Vacancies in Cavalry and Guards, *July 11*, 255.

Recruiting, Effect of Reorganisation Proposals on, *July 11*, 252.

Marlborough, Duke of — *Parliamentary Secretary for the Colonies*

Emigration—Numbers and Nationalities of Persons leaving the United Kingdom for places outside Europe—Return, *July 11*, 239.

Merchant Shipping.

Ballasting of Ships, Loss of Life due to Shifting of Ballast—Carrying out Recommendations of Light Load-line Committee, *July 21*, 1507–1510.

Foreign Apprentices on British Ships, Number of, Regulations as to granting Certificates to, etc., *July 21*, 1512.

Transvaal — Chinese Labour — Flogging Regulations, Alleged Violation of, *July 20*, 1357, 1359, 1360.

Workmen's Compensation Act, Extensions of Provisions of, to Seamen and Masters of Ships, proposed, *July 18*, 1040.

Marriage of a Deceased Wife's Sister

Colonial Marriages, Importance of Legalising, in Great Britain.

Os. Lord James of Hereford, *July 13*, 524–527; Marquess of Lansdowne, 526, 527; Lord Ranfurly, 527.

Communications between Governor-General of Australia, and H.M. Government, Information as to.

Os. Lord James of Hereford, *July 13*, 524, 526; Marquess of Lansdowne, 626.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill

Withdrawal of, proposed.

Os. Sir J. Fergusson, Col. Lockwood, *July 10*, 109.

Marriages

Report, Annual, with Supplements, Presented, *July 17*, 805, 851.

Marshall Islands.

British Shipping Trade, German Treatment of — Termination by German Government of Agreement with Jaluit Company, etc.

Os. Earl of Jersey, *July 13*, 527, 528; Marquess of Lansdowne, 528, 529.

Matheson Estate

Evictions, Legislation to deal with, proposed.

Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 568.

Matlock Bath Improvement Bill

c. Con.,* *July 20*, 1362.

Matrimonial Causes Bill

l. 1R.* *July 21*, 1500.

Maxwell, Mr. W. J. [Dumfriesshire]

Education (Scotland) Bill, *com.*, *July 14*, 755.

Mayberry, F. G., Estate of

Sale of, Progress of Negotiations as to

Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 88.

Mayo, Earl of

Drunkenness (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 733; *com.*, *July 17*, 846, 847.

Horses suffering from Epizootic Lymphangitis, Steps Taken to carry out Regulations laid down by Circular of 1904, etc., *July 11*, 220–222.

Army Horses, Number Affected, Progress made with Stamping Out Disease, etc., *July 11*, 228.

Outbreak in England, Information as to, *July 17*, 841.

Land Act, 1903, Working of, Reason for Alleged Failure of, etc, *July 14*, 705.

London County Council (Tramways) Bill—Postponement of Second Reading for three months, proposed, *July 18*, 1005.

Meath

Untenanted Land purchased in.

Q. Mr. Kildride; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 397, 398.

Meath, Earl of

Cigarette Smoking among Juveniles, Legislation to Prevent, proposed, *July 20*, 1325, 1326.

Education.

Continuation Classes, Making Attendance at, Compulsory, proposed, *July 20*, 1325.

Rural, Improvement of, proposed, *July 20*, 1324.

Factories and Workshops—Medical Examination of Employees, proposed, *July 20*, 1323, 1324.

[*cont.*

Meath, Earl of—*cont.*

Houses, Owners of, Taking Steps to secure Accurate Register of, *July 20*, 1323.

Medical Officers of Health, Dismissal of, Keeping Powers as to, in hands of Local Government Board, proposed, *July 20*, 1323.

Physical Deterioration Committee, Report and Recommendations of, Steps Taken to give Effect to, *July 20*, 1319–1326.

Medical Act (1886) Amendment Bill

c. Con. July 10*, 211.
3r., *July 18*, 1164.
l. 1r.* *July 20*, 1299.

Medical Officers of Health

Dismissal of, Keeping Power of, in hands of Local Government Board, proposed.
Os. Earl of Meath, *July 20*, 1323; Lord Kenyon, 1344.

Register of Sickness, Advisability of Keeping.
Os. Lord Kenyon, *July 20*, 1341.

Reports from, Regulations as to.
Os. Lord Kenyon, *July 20*, 1345.

Whole-time Appointments, question of.
Os. Lord Kenyon, *July 20*, 1344.

Members of Parliament

Political Pressure on, by Civil Servants—Proposals for Prevention.
Q. Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 269.

Merchant Shipping

Ballasting of Ships, Loss of Life caused by shifting of Loose Ballast—Carrying out Recommendations of Light Load-line Committee, proposed.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 21*, 1501–1506, 1510, 1511; Duke of Marlborough, 1507–1510; Earl Spencer, 1509–1511.

"County of Anglesey," Accident to, through shifting of Ballast, Result of Inquiry.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 21*, 1504, 1505.

Floating Mines in the China Seas, Dangers arising from—Employing H.M. Ships to clear away Mines, proposed.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 10*, 49–53; Marquess of Linlithgow, 53.

Foreign Apprentices on British Ships, Number of Regulations as to Granting Certificates to, etc.
Q. Lord Muskerry; *A.* Duke of Marlborough, *July 21*, 1511, 1512.

"Greyhounds" of the Mercantile Marine, Value of, as Auxiliaries of the Navy in Time of War.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 17*, 807–812; Marquess of Linlithgow, 813, 814.

Merchant Shipping—*cont.*

"Kyber," Loss of—Adoption of Suggestions of Court of Inquiry.
Q. Mr. Spear; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 20*, 1385.

Marshall Islands—German Treatment of British Trade—Termination of German Government Agreement with Jaluit Company.
Os. Earl of Jersey, *July 13*, 527, 528; Marquess of Lansdowne, 528, 529.

"Moel Tryvan," Loss of, through shifting of Ballast—Date of carrying out Recommendations of Light Load-line Committee.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 21*, 1503.

Passages, Cabin and Steerage, from the Continent, Difference in Cost of.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 17*, 882.

Russian Cruisers, Seizure and detention of British Vessels by—Claims for Compensation dealt with, probable Date of Settlement, etc.
Os. Lord Muskerry, Marquess of Lansdowne, Vis. Sidmouth, Earl of Camperdown, *July 13*, 522–524.

Seamen—Workmen's Compensation Act, Extension of Provisions of, to Seamen and Masters of Ships, proposed.
Os. Lord Muskerry, Duke of Marlborough, *July 18*, 1040.

Subsidies, Objections to System of.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 17*, 807–813; Marquess of Linlithgow, 813, 814.

Merionethshire

Education Grants, Payment of.
Q. Mr. O. Williams; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 10*, 85.

Merthyr Tydvil

Redistribution Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 12*, 381, 382.

Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill

c. Con. July 11*, 242.
3r.* *July 14*, 734.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.,* July 17*, 802.

Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Acton District) Bill

c. Rep. July 13*, 531.
Con. July 19*, 1169.

Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill

l. 3r.* *July 11*, 214.
c. 1r.* *July 11*, 244.

Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill
l. Rep. July 11*, 214.
3R.* *July 17*, 802.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, North]
Aliens Bill, *Com., July 10*, 126.

Midland Railway Bill
l. Rep. July 13*, 509.
3R.* *July 18*, 1017.

Midwives Act
Poor Law Guardians, issue of Midwifery Orders by, to Women unable to obtain assistance of Registered Midwives at Confinements, proposed.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 864, 865.

Mildmay, Mr. F. B. [Devon, Totnes]
Divisions, Time occupied by—Alteration in System, proposed, *July 11*, 269.

Militia
Commands, Reorganisation of, Information as to.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 17*, 833, 835, 836; Earl of Donoughmore, 833-835; Lord Harris, 834, 835.

Mobilisation Arrangements, Information as to.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 17*, 833, 835, 836; Earl of Donoughmore, 833, 834; Lord Harris, 834.

Nucleus of Home-service Army, Proposals as to.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 662, 663.

Reorganisation Proposals.
Os. Marquess of Ripon, *July 10*, 45; Earl of Wemyss, 47, 48.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 252.

Discussion, Opportunity for.
Qs. Mr. R. Lucas, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 267, 268.

Millport Piers and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill
l. 3R.* *July 11*, 215.

Mines
Accidents in—Fatal Accident—Period of Time between Accident and Death necessary for Case to be described as fatal in Statistics.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 17*, 854, 855.

Wattstown Colliery Disaster, Inquiry into, proposed—Provision of Special Apparatus for Rescue Parties, etc.
Qs. Mr. T. Richards, Mr. Jno. Wilson, Mr. K. Hardie, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir A. Thomas; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1378-1380.

Mr. Speaker's Retirement Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

"Moel Tryvan," s.s.
Loss of, through shifting of Ballast—Date of carrying out Recommendations of Light Load-line Committee.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 21*, 1503.

Moon, Mr. E. R. P. [St. Pancras, North]
Chinese Government, Disregard by, o Mackay Treaty, alleged, *July 20*, 1371

Hyde Park Corner Traffic, Obstruction caused to, by Unemployed Workmen Bill Demonstration, *July 17*, 853.

Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Dublin Co., South]
Dublin—College of Science—Proposals as to Engineering School, *July 12*, 401 402.

Questions, Alterations in, at the Table—Rules as to communicating with Members, *July 13*, 557.

Redistribution Proposals, Anomalies of, *July 18*, 1081, 1082.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J. [Montrose Burghs.]
Churches (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 12*, 421

Morocco
Conference of French and German Governments—Position of Great Britain, etc.
Os. Earl Spencer, *July 11*, 240 Marquess of Lansdowne, 241.
Qs. Mr. Disraeli, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Earl Percy, *July 17*, 873.

Trade—Revision of Provisions in Anglo-French Convention as to French Monopoly of Moroccan Trade, proposed
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 17*, 861.

Trade Report Presented, *July 20*, 1298.

Morrell, Mr. G. H. [Oxon, Woodstock]
Education—Pupil teachers—Grants earned by Attendance at Schools conducted for Private Profit, *July 10*, 70.

Tuberculosis (Bovine)—Date of Presenting Committee Reports, *July 18*, 1045.

Motor Car Acts
Working of—Proposals as to Inquiry.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 10*, 83.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason, Mr. Soares; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 99, 100.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 12*, 394.

Scope of Inquiry, Public Admission to Proceedings of.
Q. Mr. B. Robinson; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 878.

Motors

Continental Rules and Regulations for—Number of Cars in use on Continent and Number of Accidents during past year—Tabling Information as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Soares ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 865.

Edinburgh — King's Park — Reason for Closing Upper Roads to Motors.
Q. Sir L. McIver ; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 13*, 535.

Iveagh-Pirrie Motor-Car Scheme—Progress made with—Advantages of Route from Galway to Costello, etc.
Os. Lord Killanin, *July 13*, 518–520 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 520-522.

Licences for Drivers, Printing Photographs of Holders on, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 11*, 264.

Parks, Speed Regulations in.
Os. Mr. Soares, Mr. Flavin, *July 11*, 265.
Qs. Mr. Scott-Montagu ; *As.* Lord Balcarres, Mr. G. Balfour, *July 11*, 264, 265.

Prosecutions—Devoting Fines to Abating the Dust Nuisance, proposed.
Q. Mr. Scott-Montagu ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 18*, 1062.

Speed Regulations, Penalty for Breaches of—Essex County Council Resolution.
Q. Sir C. Rasch ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 10*, 83.

Muldoon, Mr. J. [Donegal, N.]

Buncrana—Reason for not including in Londonderry Telephone Area, *July 20*, 1400.

Constabulary, R.I.

Masterson and Cryan, Trial of, Tabling Judge's Notes, etc., used in, proposed, *July 20*, 1393.

Truncheon, Instructions as to use of, *July 17*, 883 ; *July 20*, 1392.

Land Act, 1903, Failure of, *July 20*, 1425, 1427–1429.

Land Purchase.

Loans, Security for—Farcical Nature of Procedure before Judicial Commissioner, *July 20*, 1426, 1427.

Regulations Issued to Estates Commissioners, Provisions of, *July 20*, 1425, 1428, 1429.

Local Government Board—Appointment of Assistant to Law Adviser, *July 17*, 885.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Salary of—Date of coming into Operation of Proposed Reduction under Development Grant Bill, *July 17*, 884.

Municipal Corporations

Expenditure and Financial Position — Inquiry proposed.
Q. Mr. M. Hall ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 63.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, East]

Cragg and Arderone Farm, Acquisition and Disposal of, *July 18*, 1072, 1073.

Evicted Tenants, Re-instatements of Delay in, *July 20*, 1446.

Estates Commissioners.

Powers of, under New Regulations, *July 13*, 564.

Unoccupied Farm forming Portion of an Estate—Power to Define as an Estate, *July 11*, 267.

Re-instatements effected by, *July 17*, 888.

Kerry Evicted Tenants, Re-instatements of, *July 10*, 94, 95 ; *July 12*, 401.

Land Act, 1903.

Instructions contained in Confidential Correspondence with Estates Commissioners, *July 12*, 400.

Landlords, Interests of, upheld to Detriment of those of Tenants, *July 20*, 1445, 1446.

Section 5, Interpretation of, *July 12*, 401.

Land Purchase.

Agreements.

Powers of Estates Commissioners to refuse approval to, *July 18*, 1074, 1075.

Provisional, Powers of Estates Commissioners as to Inquiry into, *July 13*, 564.

Precedence to Landlords who have dealt fully with Evicted Tenants, proposed, *July 20*, 1398.

Murray, Col. C. W. [Bath]

Bordon Camp, Drainage of, Measure taken to prevent Pollution of River Wey, &c. *July 10*, 76.

Musical Copyright Bill

c. 1R.* *July 11*, 273.

Muskerry, Lord

Floating Mines in China Seas, Dangers arising from—Employing H.M. Ships to clear away Mines, proposed, *July 10*, 49-53.

Home Defence—Harbours, Objections to placing Defence of, in hands of Naval Officers, *July 10*, 35, 36.

Merchant Shipping.

Ballasting of Ships, Loss of Life due to Shifting of Ballast—Carrying out Recommendations of Light Load-line Committee, proposed, *July 21*, 1501-1506, 1510, 1511.

Foreign Apprentices on British Ships, Number of, Regulations as to granting Certificates to, &c., *July 21*, 1511.

[*cont.*

Muskerry, Lord—*cont.*
Russian Cruisers, Seizure and Detention of British Vessels by—Claims dealt with, Probable date of Settlement, &c., *July 13*, 522.
Workmen's Compensation Act, Extension of Provisions of, to Seamen and Masters of Ships, proposed, *July 18*, 1040.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
Civil Service Assistant Clerks, New Class, Number and Salaries of, *July 17*, 859, 860; *July 21*, 1519.
Dublin—Education Office, Promotions in, *July 10*, 71.
Liverpool Dock Strike — Imported Labourers.
Quarters, alleged Insanitary Condition of, *July 12*, 380.
Smoking, Enforcement of Regulations as to, *July 12*, 380; *July 17*, 851.
Post Office, Wages, Political Pressure by Staff to obtain Increase of, Postmaster-General's Statement as to, *July 18*, 1063.

National Monuments in Churches
Removal of, without Parliamentary Sanction, Introduction of Legislation to prevent.
Os. Sir E. Lees, *July 19*, 1193, 1195; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1194.

Naval Prize Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read and discharged and Bill withdrawn, *July 17*, 992.

Naval Works Bill
Copies, Date of procuring.
Os. Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 1192.
Date of Introduction.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 12*, 385.
Q. Mr. E. Robertson; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 543.
Discussion on, Opportunity for.
Os. Mr. J. H. Lewis, Mr. E. Robertson, *July 18*, 1084; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1085, 1086; Mr. Dalziel, 1085.
Expenditure under, Information as to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 19*, 1196, 1197; Mr. A. Lee, 1197, 1198; Mr. Bowles, 1198, 1199.
Loan System, Objections to—Possibility of terminating.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 19*, 1197; Mr. A. Lee, 1198; Mr. Bowles, 1199-1201; Sir C. Dilke, 1203; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1204; Mr. S. Buxton, 1205; Mr C. Warner, 1205, 1206; Mr. Lough, 1206.
Memorandum showing Works upon which Expenditure is proposed to be provided, Presented, *July 19*, 1171; *July 20*, 1298.
Schedule, Circulation of, to Members.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 1204.

Navy
First Lord—Earl Cawdor.
Financial Secretary—Mr. Pretyman.
Armour Plate, Orders for.
Q. Mr. J. F. Hope; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 246, 247.
Boilers—Belleville Type, Advantages of.
O. Mr. Lucas, *July 12*, 474.
Dockyards.
Chatham Extension Works, Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 19*, 1196; Mr. A. Lee, 1197.
Deputations from Workmen, practice of Admiralty as to receiving.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, *July 12*, 491; Mr. K. Hardie, 491, 493; Mr. Pretyman, 493–495; Mr. A. Henderson, Mr. Shackleton, 494.
Devonport—Upholstery Work allocated to Women.
Q. Mr, Benn; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 10*, 69.
Discharges from.
Information as to.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, *July 12*, 491; Mr. K. Hardie, 492; Mr. Pretyman, 495, 496.
System adopted by the Admiralty.
Os. Bishop of Winchester, *July 10*, 54, 55; Marquess of Linlithgow, 57, 58.
Haulbowline, Improving position of, proposed.
Os. Mr. H. Robertson, *July 12*, 482; Mr. A. Lee, 486.
Newhaven, Establishment of Dockyard at, proposed.
Os. Mr. C. Macdona, *July 12*, 479; Mr. A. Lee, 485.
Portsmouth, Discharges from—Assistance to Workmen to Emigrate, proposed.
Q. Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 14*, 738.
Railway Extension in, Saving effected by.
O. Mr. A. Lee, *July 12*, 486.
Salaries of Officials, Increase in.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 496; Earl of Dalkeith, *July 12*, 475; Mr. Dalziel, 491; Mr. K. Hardie, 492; Mr. A. Henderson, 495.
Wages, Decrease in.
Os. Earl of Dalkeith, *July 12*, 475; Mr. Dalziel, 491; Mr. K. Hardie, 492, 493; Mr. A. Henderson, 495; Mr. Pretyman, 496.
Woolwich — Building Contract of Messrs. Playfair—Hours of Labour and Overtime Pay of Men employed.
Q. Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. B
Davenport, *July 14*, 744.
Working Short Time, proposed.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Pretyman, *July 12*, 495.

Navy—*cont.*

- Flogging in, Regulations as to, "Boscawen" Case, &c.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Hunt, Mr. Bright; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 256, 257.
- Malta Fever, Origin of, and Number of Men invalided by (1895–1905).
  - *Q.* Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 20*, 1371, 1372.
- Manœuvres, Publication of Results of, proposed.
  - *O.* Mr. R. Lucas, *July 12*, 473.
- Marines, Royal—Age Limit for Major-Generals.
  - *Q.* Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 247.
- Mediterranean Fleet, Admiral of—Sanction of Admiralty to presence at Bull-fight in Spain.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 17*, 865.
- Merchant Cruisers, Value of, as Auxiliaries in Time of War—Policy of Subsidising.
  - *Os.* Lord Brassey, *July 17*, 807–812; Marquess of Linlithgow, 813, 814.
- Nucleus Crews
  - Manœuvres with, Results of.
    - *Os.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 12*, 497.
  - Repairing Work in Dockyards, Effect on.
    - *Os.* Earl of Dalkeith, *July 12*, 475; Mr. A. Lee, 485, 486; Mr. Pretyman, 495.
- Obsolete Vessels sold at Portsmouth, Names of, Prices realised, &c.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. H. Lewis; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 18*, 1043, 1044, 1053, 1054.
- Repairs, *see under subheading* Shipbuilding.
- Reserve Forces, Organisation and Training of
  - *Os.* Lord Brassey, *July 17*, 812; Marquess of Linlithgow, 814, 815.
- Rosyth Base, Information as to Expenditure on.
  - *Os.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 19*, 1196; Mr. A. Lee, 1197, 1202; Mr. Buchanan, 1202.
- "St. Vincent" Training Ship, Abandonment of, in favour of Shore Establishment.
  - *Os.* Bishop of Winchester, *July 10*, 54–56; Marquess of Linlithgow, 58.
- Salvage Work of the Fleet, Developing, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. R. Lucas, *July 12*, 474; Mr. Spear, 477, 478.
- Savings Banks — Accounts Presented, *July 10*, 3, 62.
- Seamen, Debts of—Regulations as to giving Addresses, &c., to Creditors.
  - *Q.* Mr. McFadden; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *July 17*, 868.

Navy—*cont.*

- Shipbuilding.
  - Cost of, Comparative, in Government and Private Yards.
    - *Os.* Mr. K. Hardie, *July 12*, 492.
  - Number, Cost, &c., of Ships Built since 1893 in Naval Dockyards and by Contract—Return Ordered, *July 10*, 212.
  - Repairs.
    - Government Yards, Advantages of, over Private Yards.
      - *Os.* Sir F. Banbury, *July 12*, 480; Mr. A. Lee, 484, 485.
    - Nucleus Crews, Effect of System of, on Repairing Work.
      - *Os.* Earl of Dalkeith, *July 12*, 475; Mr. A. Lee, 485, 486; Mr. Pretyman, 495.
- Store Depôt at West India Docks, Sum allotted for.
  - *Os.* Mr. H. Robertson, *July 12*, 482.
- Submarines.
  - Abolition of Use of, proposed.
    - *Q.* Mr. Broadhurst; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 544; *July 19*, 1186.
  - Accidents.
    - Escape for Crew, Devising Means of, proposed.
      - *Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 20*, 1372, 1373.
    - Hatches capable of being opened in Emergencies to provide for Escape of Crew, proposed.
      - *Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 12*, 385, 386.
    - Preventing Recurrence of, Steps taken for.
      - *Os.* Earl of Dalkeith, *July 12*, 476; Sir W. Tomlinson, 481.
  - Extra Men in Addition to Crew, Regulations as to.
    - *Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 20*, 1372.
  - Salvage Equipment, Importance of having ready in Dockyards.
    - *Os.* Mr. Spear, *July 12*, 477, 478; Mr. A. Lee, 483, 484.
  - Utility of, Result of Experiments as to, &c.
    - *Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 12*, 380.
- Theatres, Barrack, Regulations for Management of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 13*, 532.
  - Deal Regulations as to.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. A. Lee, *July 13*, 545; *July 20*, 1376.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
- Wireless Telegraphy System, Application of.
  - *Q.* Sir T. Dewar ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 247.
- Works—Committee to Authorise Payments for, out of Consolidated Fund — Resolutions (Mr. Pretyman), *July 18*, 1084 ; (Mr. A. Lee), *July 19*, 1196.

Navy Estimates
- Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.
  - Contract Work — £7,827,800, *Rep.*, *July 12*, 471.
  - *Matériel*, £4,816,900, *Rep.*, *July 12*, 471.
  - *Personnel*, £2,768,300, *Rep.*, *July 12*, 471.

Netherlands
- Convention as to Settlement of Certain Classes of Questions by Arbitration, Presented, *July 21*, 1500.

Netterville Estate
- Woodbrook Farm, Purchase and Disposal of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Reddy ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 19*, 1182.

New Members Sworn
- *See under* Parliamentary Elections.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *July 10*, 60.
  - *Rep.** *July 18*, 1041.

Newhaven
- Naval Dockyard at, Establishment of, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. C. Macdona, *July 12*, 479 ; Mr. A. Lee, 485.

Newport (Mon.)
- Redistribution Proposals as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 12*, 382.

Newspapers
- Reading from, during Debate, Propriety of.
  - *Os.* Earl of Halsbury, *July 10*, 52.

Newton, Lord
- Coal Mines (Weighing of Minerals) Bill, 2R., *July 13*, 511.
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 1300, 1304.
- Home Defence.
  - Invasion, Possibilities of, *July 10*, 33, 34.
  - Navy as Sole Means of, Supplementing, by Increased Land Defences, proposed, *July 10*, 33, 35.
- London County Council (Tramways) Bill—Postponement of Second Reading, proposed, *July 17*, 803.

Newton, Lord—*cont.*
- Macedonia, Condition of Progress mad with Reform Schemes, etc., *July 18*, 1020–1026, 1039.
- Military Requirements at Home an Abroad, Importance of Ascertaining *July 10*, 34, 35.

Nigeria
- Northern—Decision as to Railway Development question.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Emmott ; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 13*, 547, 548.

Nolan, Col. J. P. [Galway, N.]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 155.
- Army Recruiting, System of, *July 13*, 673
- Land Purchase, Funds Available for *July 12*, 402.
- War Office—Financial Branch, Reorganisation of, *July 13*, 673.

Norman, Mr. H. [Wolverhampton, S.]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 351, 358 ; *Con.* *July 17*, 965, 967.

North British Railway (General Powers Bill
- *l.* *Rep.** *July 18*, 1017.

North East London Railway Bill
- *c.* *Rep.** *July 14*, 735.
  - *Con.*,* *July 19*, 1169.
  - 3R.* *July 20*, 1363.
- *l.* 1R.* *July 20*, 1297.

North Metropolitan Electric Powe Supply Bill
- *c.* *Rep.** *July 13*, 530.

North Sea Fisheries Investigation
- Committee Report, 1902–1903, Presented *July 13*, 511, 532.

North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways (Light Railway) Order, 1905
- Presented, *July 14*, 686, 736.

Norton, Capt. C. W. [Newington, W.]
- Civil Service Assistant Clerks, Salaries of *July 13*, 555.
- Roberts, Earl, Pay of, *July 12*, 387.

Norwood.
- Poor Law Schools, Diphtheria Outbreak in—Decision as to breaking up School.
  - *Q.* Sir W. Foster ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 18*, 1046.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
- Dublin Metropolitan Police—Delay in issuing Annual Report, *July 17*, 888.
- Police, Metropolitan, Injuries to, while on Duty, Question of Compensation, etc., *July 13*, 559.

O'Brien, Mr. P. J. [Tipperary, North]

South African War—Sentences on Military Prisoners—Case of T. Leonard, *July 10*, 81.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to taking, *July 17*, 900 ; *July 19*, 1186.

O'Connor, Mr. J. [Wicklow, West]

Dublin, Probate Court—Clerk of the Seat, Information as to Duties, Salaries, etc., of, *July 18*, 1075, 1076.

Postmen, Provincial—Proposals as to Allowances, *July 13*, 536.

Waterford, Estate of Marquess of—Blackditches Farm—Reinstatement Application of Mrs. Cullen, *July 18*, 1072.

Wicklow Evicted Tenants, Applications from, and Reinstatements effected, *July 18*, 1070.

O'Connor, Mr. John [Kildare]

Drainage, Arterial, Proposals as to Appointment of Commission of Inquiry into, *July 20*, 1398.

Limerick Moneylending Case—Claim of Mr. Gaffee, *July 20*, 1387.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]

Land Act, 1903.

- Failure of, to settle the Land Question, *July 20*, 1483, 1484.
- Price of Land enhanced by, *July 20*, 1484.

O'Donell Estate.

Sale of, Progress of Negotiations for.
Q. Dr. Ambrose ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 74.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, West]

Blennerhassett Estate—Reinstatement of W. O'Neill and B. Sheehy, *July 20*, 1392.

Camp—Purchase of Estate of Mr. F. Day, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, etc., *July 20*, 1366.

Dublin—Trinity College Estates, Proposals as to Sale of, *July 20*, 1391.

Education.

- Extra Subjects, Fees paid for—Modification of Circular, *July 13*, 537.
- National School Teachers—Salaries of 1 (1) Class under new Code, *July 13*, 537.

O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, South]

Act of Union, Repeal of, proposed, *July 17*, 867.

Armstrong Estate Untenanted Lands, Disposal of, *July 17*, 857.

Floughena, O'Connor Estate—Provision for Reinstatement of Children of T. Durkan, *July 17*, 856.

India, Press Censorship in, *July 11*, 261.

O'Kelly, Mr. C. [Mayo, North]

Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas, alleged Infringement of Act of Union, etc., *July 12*, 403–406.

O'Kelly, Mr. J. [Roscommon, North]

French, Maj., Estate of—Disposal of Grazing Lands, *July 20*, 1389.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, West]

Abbeyfeale, Land purchase in, Information as to, *July 17*, 889.

Limerick, Agrarian Outrages in, Persons living under Police Protection, etc., *July 17*, 889–891.

Sale of Butter Bill, proposals as to taking, *July 17*, 903.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W.]

Waterford—Horses, Restrictions on Movement of, consequent on Outbreak of Epizootic Lymphangitis, *July 13*, 539.

Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill

c. 2R.* *July 17*, 849.

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways Bill.

c. 2R.* *July 17*, 849.

Onslow, Lord

Horses suffering from Epizootic Lymphangitis—Army Horses, Number affected, Progress made with Stamping out Disease, etc., *July 11*, 227, 228.

London County Council (Tramways) Bill—Postponement of Second Reading for three months, proposed, *July 17*, 804 ; *July 18*, 1009-1012.

Orange River Colony

Affairs — Further Correspondence Presented, *July 21*, 1500, 1517.

Oranmore and Browne, Lord

Land Act, 1903, Working of, Reason for Alleged Failure, etc., *July 14*, 707.

Ormsby-Gore, Mr. S. F. [Lincoln, Gainsborough]

Volunteer Artillery — Re-arming with Modern Guns, etc., Delay in, *July 13*, 610-612.

Oswestry

Sheep Market, Effect of Sheep-Scab Regulations on Trade of.
Q. Mr. Bright ; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 18*, 1044, 1045.

Overcrowding

Recommendations of Physical Deterioration Committee, Carrying out.
O. Lord Kenyon, *July 20*, 1342.

Oxford, Bishop of

Macedonia, Condition of, Progress made with Reform Schemes, etc., *July 18*, 1028-1030.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill

l. 1R.* *July 11*, 215.

2R. and *rep.** *July 21*, 1498, 1499.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]

Aliens Bill, *con.*, *July 17*, 929–931.

Canadian Cattle, Removal of Restrictions on Importation of, proposed, *July 12*, 322.

Cape Colony Wine, Preferential Treatment for, proposed, *July 17*, 859.

Compulsory Military Service—Canadian Government Proposals, *July 13*, 619.

Volunteers.

Duties of, Definition of, *July 13*, 617, 618.

Reduction in Numbers of, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 617–620.

Parks and Gardens

Motor Speed Regulations, *see under* Motors.

Parliament

House of Lords.

New Peer Introduced — Viscount Selby, *July 18*, 997.

Representative Peers for Ireland—Viscount Hawarden, Claim of, to Vote at Elections — Presented, *July 13*, 509; established, *July 20*, 1297; *July 21*, 1497.

Sat first.

Chichester, Earl of, after the Death of his Father, *July 10*, 1.

Cork and Orrery, Earl, after the Death of his Father, *July 11*, 213.

Southesk, Earl of, after the Death of his Father, *July 18*, 997.

Parliamentary Agents

Bircham, Messrs.—Retention of Appointment to Board of Trade.
Q. Mr. Benn; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 877, 878.

Parliamentary Elections

New Members Sworn.

Chance, Mr. F. W., for Borough of Carlisle, *July 19*, 1192.

Liddell, Mr. H., for County of Down (West Down Division), *July 17*, 902.

Parliamentary Electoral Areas, Redistribution of

Anomalies of Proposed System.
Qs. Mr. Mooney; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 18*, 1081, 1082.

Parliamentary Electoral Areas—*cont.*

Boundary Commission.

Appointment and Terms of Reference
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 18*, 1053.

Constitution and Terms of Reference of
O. Mr. MacNeill, *July 20*, 1406.
Qs. Sir H. Kimber, Mr. Peel, Mr McKenna, Sir C. Dilke, Mr Dalziel, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1403–1406.

Payment of, Provision for.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. G Balfour, *July 17*, 881.

Procedure in Appointing, Precedent for Government Course of Action etc.
Qs. Sir J. Dickson-Poynder Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir C. Dilke, Mr Lambert, Mr. Dalziel, Mr Bryce; *As.* Mr. A. J Balfour, *July 18*, 1077–1080

Constituencies of the United Kingdom—Return as to List, Effect of Redistribution Proposals, etc.
Q. Mr. Toulmin; *A.* Mr. G Balfour, *July 17*, 855, 856.

Government Proposals, Information as to
Os. Sir H. Fowler, *July 10*, 106; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 106, 107; Sir H Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. J. Redmond, 107.

Ireland

Act of Union, Representation under Basis of Fixing, etc.
O. Sir G. Bartley, *July 17*, 896
Qs. Mr. C. O'Kelly, Mr. Coghill, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *July 12*, 403–406.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 867.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. J Redmond. Mr. T. W Russell; *As.* Mr. A. J Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *July 17*, 893-896.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 18*, 1080–1081.

Down, South, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 18*, 1083.

Northcote, late Sir S., and late Marquess of Salisbury, Opinions of, in 1884.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 1185, 1186.

Parliamentary Representation in 1832, 1842, and 1852 if calculated on a Population Basis.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 543, 544.

[*cont.*

Parliamentary Electoral Areas—*cont.*
  King's Lynn, Proposals as to.
    Qs. Mr. F. Wilson, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 568, 569.
  Memorandum by President of the Local Government Board Presented, *July 10*, 60.
  Merthyr Tydvil, proposals as to.
    Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *July 12*, 381, 382.
  Newport, Mon., Proposals as to.
    Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 12*, 382.
  Plural Voters in the United Kingdom, Number of.
    Qs. Mr. Black; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 13*, 554.
  Population Limit Proposed, Effect of.
    Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 20*, 1381, 1382.
    Amendment proposed.
      Qs. Mr. Lambert; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 879, 880.
  Resolution.
    Discussion of, Opportunity for.
      Qs. Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 12*, 407, 408.
    Procedure in taking as one Resolution, or submitting to Committee of the House.
      Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. G. Bowles; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *As.* Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 896–899.
  Scotland.
    Govan, Proposals as to.
      Q. Mr. H. Craig; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 879.
    Kincardineshire and Aberdeen, Disparity between.
      Qs. Mr. Crombie; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 18*, 1082.
  Statement, Date of Tabling.
    Qs. Mr. G. Kenyon, Mr. MacNeill, *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*,, 98, 99.
    Q. Mr. Toulmin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 20*, 1382.
  Wiltshire, Proposals as to.
    Q. Mr. Fuller; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 893.

Parliamentary Procedure
  Closure, Discretion of Speaker as to moving.
    Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *July 12*, 499; Mr. Speaker, 500.
  Divisions.
    Delay of Opposition Members in Proceeding to the Lobby.
      Os. Mr. Markham, *July 11*, 325, 326; Mr. Chairman, 326.
    Time occupied by — Inquiry into Mechanical Methods of recording Votes, proposed.
      Os. Mr. Scott-Montagu, *July 11*, 268; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 268, 269; Mr. Mildmay, 269.

Pease, Mr. H. Pike [Darlington]
  Vagrancy Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *July 10*, 63.

Peel, Mr. W. R. W. [Manchester, S.]
  Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 989, 990.
  Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas, Boundary Commission, Terms of Reference of, *July 20*, 1403.

Percy, Earl—*Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs* [Kensington, South]
  Algiers, British Consulate in—Hours of Business, Fees charged, etc., *July 18*, 1047.
  Borneo, British North — Conditions of Employment of Chinese Coolie Labour, *July 11*, 262; *July 17*, 861; *July 19*, 1172; *July 20*, 1371.
  China, Mackay Treaty disregarded by, alleged, *July 20*, 1371.
  Crete, British and Foreign Troops in, *July, 11*, 249.
  France—Separation of Church and State—probable Effect on British subjects owning Church Property in France, *July 20*, 1371.
  Ireland, Foreign Consuls in, *July 12*, 403.
  Macedonian Disturbances.
    Adrianople Refugees in Bulgaria, Information as to, *July 13*, 535.
    Mürzsteg Programme — Exemption of Burnt Christian Villages from one year's Taxation, *July 19*, 1172.
    Zervi Village, Outrages of Turkish Soldiers at—Measures taken to punish Offenders, *July 13*, 552.
  Morocco.
    Conference between France and Germany, etc., Nations taking part in, Proposal received by Great Britain, *July 17*, 873.
    Trade, Revision of Provisions in Anglo-French Convention as to, proposed, *July 17*, 861.
  Trade Reports, Monthly, proposed, *July 11*, 249.
  Trade Statistics, Instructions to Consuls as to Collecting—Separate Returns for Irish Trade, etc., *July 10*, 83; *July 13*, 551.

Perks, Mr. R. W. [Lincolnshire, Louth]
  Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 299.
  Churches (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 12*, 447–449, 450, 451.

Persia
  Bushire, Declaration of, as unhealthy place within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, Presented, *July 14*, 686, 736.

Physical Deterioration
Anthropometric Survey to collect *data* as to, Institution of, proposed.
Os. Duke of Devonshire, *July 20*, 1312, 1315, 1316, 1319; Lord Shuttleworth, 1326; Marquess of Londonderry, 1334–1336, 1348; Earl of Crewe, 1348.
Birth-rate, Diminution of—Statistics.
Os. Bishop of Ripon, *July 20*, 1306, 1307.
Infant Mortality, *see that title.*
Inter-Departmental Committee on.
Origin of appointment and terms of reference.
Os. Duke of Devonshire, *July 20*, 1313, 1314, 1352; Marquess of Londonderry, 1333, 1334; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1351.
Report and Reccomendations of.
Os. Bishop of Ripon, *July 20*, 1304; Duke of Devonshire, 1312–1319; Earl of Meath, 1319; Earl of Crewe, 1347–1350.
Measures proposed for carrying into effect.
Os. Earl of Meath, *July 20*, 1319–1321; Marquess of Londonderry, 1334, 1336–1341; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1350–1352.
Local Authorities, Powers and Duties of, Ignorance as to.
Os. Earl of Meath, *July 20*, 1322.
Population, Decline in, among the intelligent classes—Statistics, etc.
Os. Bishop of Ripon, *July 20*, 1305, 1306.
Progressive Deterioration, Allegations as to, not established.
Os. Duke of Devonshire, *July 20*, 1317, 1318.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
c. Rep. July 13*, 530.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
c. 3R.* *July 10*, 60.
l. Commons' Amendments, *con. July 21*, 1498.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill
c. 3R.* *July 10*, 60.
l. 1R.* *July 10*, 3.
2R.* *July 18*, 1018.

Piers and Harbours
Ireland—Poulduff Pier Works, Decision as to.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 11*, 251.
Scotland—Avoch Harbour Works, Date of Completion of
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 12*, 379, 380.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, North]
Education (Scotland) Bill, Possibility of passing into law this Session, *July 12*, 410.
Unemployed Workmen Bill, Proposals as to taking, *July 10*, 97; *July 12*, 411.

Poisons
Agricultural purposes, Used for—Proposa as to introduction of Bill dealing with sale.
Qs. Mr. A. Cross; *As.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 13*, 552, 553.

Police
Metropolitan.
Dublin, *see that title.*
Injuries caused to, while on duty, Compensation awarded, etc.
Qs. Mr H. Burke, Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, Mr. Speaker, *July 13*, 558–560.

Poor Law
Guardians—Unemployed persons, Work for—Powers of Guardians under Act 42 Eliz. c. 2, etc.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 19*, 1179, 1180.
Ireland—Reform Commission, Date of issuing Report of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 75
Local inquiries remaining to be made, etc.
Q Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 18*, 1073.
Midwifery Orders, Issue of, to women unable to obtain assistance of registered midwives at confinements, proposed.
Q. Sir W. Foster: *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 864, 865.
Norwood Schools, Outbreak of Diptheria in—Decision as to breaking up schools, etc.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 18*, 1046.
Paupers, Alien, in England and Wales, Number of, and Cost of Relief to.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *July 17*, 879.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Sir W. Tomlinson; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 878, 879.
Poplar, Statistics as to Pauperism in.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 13*, 533, 534.
Scotland—Aged Paupers in Poorhouses, Information as to (1881, 1891, 1901 and 1904.)
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 13*, 534, 535.

Poplar
Pauperism in, Measures proposed for preventing distress in winter, etc.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 13*, 533, 534.

Port Glasgow Improvement Provisional Order Bill

l. 3R.* *July 21*, 1498.

Portsmouth

Dockyard discharges—Assistance to Workmen to Emigrate, proposed.
Q. Mr. R. Lucas ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 14*, 738.

Portugal

Trade Report Presented, *July 17*, 804.

Post Office

Postmaster-General—Lord Stanley.

Expenditure proposed in Report of Public Accounts Committee, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Mr. G. Bowles ; *As.* Lord Stanley, *July 20*, 1380, 1381.

Ireland.

Dungloe and Burtonport, Increase of Facilities for, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Law ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 12*, 384.

Lambeg Vacancy, Appointment of Sligo Postman to.
Q. Mr. C. Craig ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 17*, 856.

Limerick Night Mail—Facilities for posting letters at Railway Station.
Q. Mr. Joyce ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 17*, 892.

North of Ireland Evening Service *viâ* Greenore, proposed,
Q. Mr. Doogan ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 17*, 891.

Leave, Annual, to Officers about to Retire, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 14*, 741.

Mail Service.

Canada, Direct Service to, Importance of Establishing—Government Subsidy, proposed.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 17*, 809.

West Indies, Arrangements as to.
Q. Mr. Lamont ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 18*, 1065.

Postal Orders.

Colonial Amendment (No. 4) Regulations 1905, Presented, *July 10*, 3, 61.

Irish Language, Use of, in signing—Case of Mr. T. O'Heidhin at Castlerea.
Q. Mr. Hayden ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 18*, 1076.

Postmen.

Assistant and Auxiliary, Conditions of Employment of.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 14*, 741.

Provincial—Proposals as to Allowances.
Q. Mr. Jas. O'Connor ; *A*, Lord Stanley, *July 13*, 536.

Post Office—*cont.*

Postmen—*cont.*

Secretaries to Building Societies, Rescinding Order prohibiting acting as, proposed.
Q. Sir T. Dewar ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 20*, 1373

Staff.

Number of Males and Females on.
Q. Mr. Crooks ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 18*, 1044.

Political Pressure by, *see under Sub-heading* Wages.

Wages, Political Pressure by Staff to obtain Increase of, Postmaster-General's Statement as to—Deputation to negotiate Disputes proposed.
Qs. Dr. Macnamara, Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Delany ; *As.* Lord Stanley, *July 18*, 1062-1064.

Postmaster-General

Lord Stanley.

Postmen

See under Post Office.

Potteries

Leadless Glaze, Number of Manufacturers using, &c.
Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 17*, 854.

Poulduff Pier

Works, Decision as to.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 11*, 251.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan

Aliens Bill, *com. July 10*, 145.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, East]

Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of—Powers of Estates Commissioners under New Regulations, *July 13*, 565.

Waterford Evictions — Applications for Reinstatement and Reinstatements effected, *July 10*, 72, 92, 93; *July 13*, 539.

Horses—Epizootic Lymphangitis, Measures taken to eradicate, *July 13*, 539.

President of the Board of Agriculture

Rt. Hon. A. E. Fellowes.

President of the Board of Education

Marquess of Londonderry.

President of the Board of Trade

Marquess of Salisbury.

President of the Local Government Board

Rt. Hon G. W. Balfour.

Press

Dissemination of News previous to outbreak of War and in time of War, Government Control over—Japanese Laws, etc.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 13*, 512-518; Marquess of Linlithgow, 518.

Pretyman, Capt. E. G.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Suffolk, Woodbridge]

Armour Plate, Orders for, *July 11*, 247.

Coalfield in Wales, Information as to Alleged Purchase of, by German Syndicate, *July 18*, 1054; *July 20*, 1384.

Devonport, Overcrowding in, High Rents, etc., *July 12*, 497, 498.

Dockyards.

Deputations from Workmen, Practice of Admiralty as to Receiving, *July 12*, 493-495.

Devonport Upholstery Work allocated to Women, *July 10*, 69.

Discharges from, *July 12*, 495, 496.

Portsmouth, Discharges from—Assistance to Workmen to Emigrate, proposed, *July 14*, 738.

Salaries, Increase in, and Decrease in Wages, alleged, *July 12*, 496.

Working Short Time, proposed, *July 12*, 495.

Flogging Regulations, *July 11*, 257.

Malta Fever, Origin of and Number of Men invalided by (1895-1905), *July 20*, 1372.

Marines, Royal—Age Limit for Major-Generals, *July 11*, 247.

Mediterranean Fleet, Admiral of—Sanction of Admiralty to Presence at Bull-fight in Spain, *July 17*, 865.

Nucleus Crews.

Manœuvres with, Results of, *July 12*, 497.

Repairing Work in Dockyards, effect on, *July 12*, 495,

Obsolete Vessels, Disposal of—Names of Vessels, Amounts realised, etc., *July 18*, 1044, 1054.

Shipbuilding—Repairing, Effect on, of System of Nucleus Crews, *July 12*, 495.

Submarines.

Accidents—Devising Means of Escape for Crews, proposed, *July 20*, 1373.

Hatches capable of being opened in Emergencies to provide for Escape of Crew, proposed, *July 12*, 386.

Extra Men, in addition to Crew, Regulations as to, *July 20*, 1372.

Utility of, Result of Experiments as to, etc., *July 12*, 380.

Pretyman, Capt. E. G.—*cont.*

Theatres, Barrack, Regulations as to, *July 13*, 532.

Deal, Regulations as to Admission to, *July 20*, 1376.

Wei-hai-wei, Expenditure on, *July 12*, 472.

Wireless Telegraphy System, Application of, *July 11*, 247.

Prevention of Cruelty to Children

See under Children.

Prime Minister

Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.

Princetown

Warders, Protection of, against Attacks.
Q. Mr. Spear; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 13*, 561.

Prison-made Goods, Foreign

Exclusion of—Increase in Amount excluded since last Statement.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 21*, 1519.

Prisons

Military—Proposals as to Improvement of Condition of Prisoners.
Qs. Mr. Bright; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 12*, 391.

Princetown Warders, Protection of, against Attacks.
Q. Mr. Spear; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 13*, 561.

Scotland—Duke Street, Glasgow—Rule as to Appointment of Visiting Committee Presented, *July 10*, 3, 61; *July 11*, 244.

Prize Courts Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read and discharged and Bill withdrawn, *July 18*, 1164.

Prosecution of Offences Acts, 1879 and 1884

Regulations of 1886, Working of—Return ordered *July 12*, 379; Presented, *July 14*, 736.

Public Accounts Committee

Report, etc., Presented, *July 12*, 415; *July 20*, 1408.

Discussion in the House, opportunity for.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 1192.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 100, 101.
Qs. Dr. Macnamara; *As.* Mr. A. J Balfour, *July 13*, 567, 568.

Post Office Expenditure proposed in.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Lord Stanley, *July 20*, 1380, 1381.

Public Libraries Acts (Extension) Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read and discharged and Bill withdrawn, *July 17*, 992.

Public Meetings (Facilities) Bill
l. Report from Standing Committee, *July 11*, 216.
Rep. * *July 13*, 512.
3R. *July 14*, 733.
c. 1R. * *July 17*, 902.
2R. * *July 19*, 1295.

Public Roads (Ireland) Bill
l. 2R. *July 21*, 1512.

Public Schools Act (1868) Amendment (Vincent Square) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 10*, 110.

Purvis, Mr. R. [Peterborough]
Aliens Bill, *con. July 18*, 1140.

Questions
Alterations in, at the Table—Rules as to communicating with Member putting Question, &c.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Mooney, Mr. G. Bowles, Sir G. Bartley; *As.* Mr. Speaker, *July 13*, 557, 558.

Circulation of unanswered Questions with the Votes, Rules as to.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 269, 270.

Prime Minister—Position on the Paper of Questions addressed to, Number remaining unanswered, &c.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, *July 20*, 1407.

Speaker's Rulings.
Alterations at the Table—Rules as to communicating with Members, *July 13*, 557, 558.
Argumentative Questions not to be put, *July 11*, 257; *July 12*, 408.
Circulation of unanswered Questions with the Votes, Rule as to, *July 11*, 270.
Hypothetical Questions not permissible, *July 10*, 91.
Notice to be given of further Questions, *July 18*, 1067, 1069, 1071.
Prime Minister, Position on the Paper of Questions addressed to, Number remaining unanswered, &c., *July 20*, 1407.
Repetition of Question after Answer has been given, *July 13*, 560.
Statements by Members not permissible in Question Time, *July 10*, 96; *July 13*, 572; *July 20*, 1379.
Supplementary Questions not arising out of original Question not permissible, *July 17*, 896.

Quit and Crown Rents (Ireland)
Sums received for Redemption and Purchase since 1897—Return proposed.
Os. Lord Castletown, Lord Windsor, *July 20*, 1353, 1354.

Railways
Electric—North-Eastern Railway—Accidents caused by Live Rails.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 13*, 554.

Footboards on Express Trains from the North, Narrowness of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 20*, 1385.

Ireland—Coal Transit Rates.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 17*, 858.

Passengers, Mr. J. Brown's invention to facilitate taking up and putting down.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 14*, 741, 742.

Receipts and Expenditure (1904)—Returns Presented, *July 20*, 1299, 1364.

Ranfurly, Lord
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, Importance of legalising in the Colonies, *July 13*, 527.

Rasch, Major Sir F. C. [Essex, Chelmsford]
Motor-Car Act, Working of—Proposals as to Inquiry.—*July 12*, 394.

Motor Speed Regulations—Resolution of Essex County Council as to Penalty for Breaches of Act, *July 10*, 83.

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Imrovement Bill
l. 2R.* *July 11*, 214.

Reay, Lord
Aden.
Harbour, Importance of Deepening—Recommendations of Commissions, etc., *July 11*, 229, 230, 238, 239.
Railway Communication with the *Hinterland*—Recommendations of Commission, *July 11*, 230, 231.
Report of Commission, Publication of, proposed, *July 11*, 231, 232, 238.
Trade Statistics for 1902–5, Publication of, proposed, *July 11*, 231, 232, 238.
Yemen.
Boundary between British Protectorate of Aden and Yemen, Demarcation of, *July 11*, 231.
Negotiations between Turkish Government and Arab Imam of Yemen, Information as to, *July 11*, 232.

Reddy, Mr. M. [King's County, Birr]
- Bristol Carnival Lottery, Action of Authorities as to, *July 11*, 262.
- Derry McEdmond Estate—Decision as to advance to Mr. Frend, *July 10*, 87.
- Gurteen Petty Sessions—Charges against and present employment of Sergeant Dunphy and Constable Daly, *July 13*, 566.
- Netterville Estate—Purchase and Disposal of Woodbrook Farm, *July 19*, 1182.
- Trenche, Mr. O'H., Sale of Estate of—Powers of Estates Commissioners to intervene, *July 19*, 1182, 1183.

Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas.
- *See* Parliamentary Electoral Areas.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford.]
- Act of Union, Irish Parliamentary Representation under, *July 17*, 894, 895.
- Business of the House, Course of, *July 18*, 1083.
- Business of the House and Duration of Session, Information as to, *July 18*, 1083 ; *July 19*, 1191.
- Churches (Scotland) Bill, Proposals as to taking, *July 12*, 410 ; *July 20*, 1395, 1396
- Education—Boys' and Girls' Schools, Objections of Roman Catholic Bishops to Amalgamation of, *July 17*, 887 ;
- Education (Scotland) Bill, possibility of passing into Law this Session, *July 12*, 507.
- Galway Jurors, Special, Qualifications of, *July 10*, 95.
- Government, Defeat of, in Division Lobbies,
  - Course of Business—Adjournment of the House till Monday, proposed, *July 20*, 1494.
  - Resignation, Statement as to, *July 20*, 1490, 1494.
- Land Act of 1903.
  - Failure of, *July 20*, 1417, 1424.
  - Funds, Proposals for augmenting, *July 18*, 1071, 1072.
- Land Purchase
  - Agreements, Powers of Estates Commissioners as to Inquiry into, *July 13*, 564.
  - Estates Commissioners, Regulations issued to, *July 20*, 1418–1424.
  - Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of, Effect of new Regulations on, *July 20*, 1424.
  - Intimidation, Inquiry into—Regulations issued to Commissioners, *July 20*, 1420–1422.
  - Untenanted Land, Disposal of—Restrictions imposed by Regulations, *July 20*, 1418, 1419, 1422, 1423.
  - Vendors of Estates, two-thirds of Purchase Money to be taken by, in Stock, and one-third in Cash, proposed *July 20*, 1416, 1417, 1425.

Redmond, Mr. J. E.—*cont.*
- Mountmellick—Charges against Constable Masterson, Date of Disappearance, etc, *July 12*, 399.
- Proclaimed Districts, Number of, etc., *July 10*, 64, 86, 87.
- Redistribution proposals of the Government, Information as to, *July 10*. 107.
  - Ireland, Effect on, alleged Infringement of Act of Union, etc., *July 12*, 404–406.
  - Resolution.
    - Discussion, Opportunity for, *July 12*, 407, 408.
    - Procedure in taking, *July 17*, 896, 898.
- Supply, Allocation of Time to, *July 19*, 1188.
- Unemployed Workmen Bill, Possibility of passing into Law this Session, *July 12*, 412, 506, 507.

Reformatories and Industrial Schools
- Day Industrial Schools, Order in Council of 11th July varying Order in Council of 25th March, 1877, Presented *July 17*, 805, 850.

Reid, Sir R. T. [Dumfries Burghs]
- Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1109, 1112, 1115, 1116, 1120, 1121, 1125; *July 19*, 1251, 1252.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 776, 777.

Relief of Released Prisoners Bill.
- c. 1 R.* *July 17*, 903.

Remnant, Mr. J. [Finsbury, Holborn]
- Administrative County of London Electric Power Company Bill — Committee, *Motion* against Appointment of, Effect of, if carried, *July 12*, 378.

Renshaw, Sir C. B. [Renfrew, West]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 749, 760.

Renwick, Mr. G. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 177 ; *July 11*, 358 ; *Con.*, *July 18*, 1139, 1150.

Revenue and Expenditure
- Capital Account, Estimated Expenditure on, during 1905-6.
  - *Q.* Mr. S. Buxton ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 14*, 743.
- Collection and Expenditure, Return as to, Presented, *July 10*, 60.
- Exchequer Receipts and Payments (1890-1905)—Return Presented, *July 12*, 379.
- Gross Departmental Expenditure, Return as to, Presented, *July 17*, 851 ; *July 18*, 1042.
- Liabilities, National, Enormous Increase in.
  - *O.* Mr. Bowles, *July 19*, 1199, 1200.

Rhondda Urban District Council Bill
- *l.* Report from Select Committee,* *July 20*, 1297.

Rhondda Valley
- Mining Disaster.
  - Inquiry into, proposals as to, etc.
    - *Qs.* Sir A. Thomas, Mr. W. Abraham; *As.* Mr. Cochrane, *July 12*, 413.
  - Resolution of Sympathy with Relatives of Victims proposed.
    - *Q.* Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 12*, 413, 414.

Rhymney and Aber Valley Gas and Water Company Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *July 17*, 849.

Richards, Mr. T. [Monmouthshire]
- Wattstown Colliery Disaster, Inquiry into, proposed, Opportunity for Discussion on, etc., *July 20*, 1378, 1379.

Rickett, Mr. J. C. [Scarborough]
- Churches (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 12*, 415-418.

Ridley, Viscount
- London County Council (Tramways) Bill—Postponement of Second Reading for Three Months—*Motion, July 18*, 997-1001, 1016.

Ridley, Mr. S. F. [Bethnal Green, South-West]
- Aliens Bill, *Com., July 11*, 335, 341; *Con., July 17*, 950, 962; *July 18*, 1141, 1142.

Ripon, Bishop of
- Birthrate, Decline in, *July 20*, 1305-1307.
- Infant Mortality, Increase in, Necessity for taking Measures to Check, *July 20*, 1309-1312.
- Physical Deterioration Committee, Report of, *July 20*, 1304-1312.

Ripon, Marquess of
- Aden Harbour, Importance of Deepening—Recommendations of Commission, etc., *July 11*, 237, 238.
- Army
  - Preparedness for War—Lord Roberts' Opinion, *July 10*, 44.
  - Short Service Army for Home Defence, *July 10*, 46.
- Home Defence, Navy as Sole Means of—Strengthening Land Defences, proposed, *July 10*, 44-47.
- Indian Army.
  - Administration, *Motion* for Papers Relating to, Postponed, *July 21*, 1513.
  - Reorganisation Proposals of Lord Kitchener, Decision of H.M. Government as to, *July 17*, 805.

Ripon, Marquess of—*cont.*
- Militia Reorganisation Proposals, *July 10*, 45.
- South African War Stores—Royal Commission of Inquiry—Powers of Sub-Commission in South Africa, *July 10*, 58.
- Volunteers—Circular Letter from War Office to Officers Commanding-in-Chief, *July 10*, 45.
- War Stores (Commission) Bill, *Com. July 10*, 58.

Ritualistic Practices
- Commission on, Date of Presenting Report of.
  - *Q.* Mr. B. Jones; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 96.

Roberts, Earl
- Army.
  - Number Required for Defence at Home and Abroad, Importance of Ascertaining, *July 10*, 13-18.
  - Preparedness for War, Condition of the Army not bettered since 1899, *July 10*, 13-18.
  - Public Indifference towards Military questions, *July 10*, 14-18.
  - Training of Officers and Men, Difficulty of Carrying out Manœuvres, etc., *July 10*, 16.
- Pay of, Authority for Continuance of, Opportunity for Discussing in Parliament, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Dalziel, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Capt. Norton, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *July 12*, 386-390.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, West]
- Bengal, Partition of—Tabling Papers proposed, *July 11*, 261.

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
- Weights and Measures Act, 1904, Date of Tabling Regulations under, *July 10*, 70.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]
- Churches (Scotland) Bill—Tenure of Property by Free and United Free Churches, *July 17*, 883.
- Coastguard Service, Estimated Expenditure on, *July 19*, 1196.
- Contraband of War—Conference proposed by United States, Subjects to be discussed, etc., *July 13*, 569.
- Naval Works Bill.
  - Date of Introducing, *July 13*, 543.
  - Discussion of, Opportunity for, *July 18*, 1084.
  - Expenditure under, Information as to, 1196-1197.
  - Schedule, Circulation of, *July 19*, 1204.

Robertson, Mr E.—*cont.*
- Navy.
  - Chatham Dockyard Extension Works, Expenditure on, *July 19*, 1196.
  - Loans Bills, Objections to System of, *July 19*, 1197.
  - Rosyth Base, Information as to Expenditure on, *July 19*, 1196.

Robertson, Mr. T. H. [Hackney, South]
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 333–234.
- Land Act, Ireland, 1903—Vendors of Estates, two-thirds of Purchase Money to be taken by, in cash, and one-third in cash, proposed, *July 20*, 1448.
- Navy.
  - Haulbowline Dockyard, Improving Position of, *July 12*, 482.
  - Store Depôt at West India Docks, Sum Allotted for, *July 12*, 482.
- Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 18*, 1167.
- Wei-Hai-Wei, Importance of, as a Naval Station, *July 12*, 481–482.

Robinson, Mr. B. [Dudley.]
- Motor Car Act Inquiry, Scope of, Public Admission to Proceedings, &c., *July 17*, 878.

Rollit, Sir A. K. [Islington, South]
- Education Grants—Decision as to continuing Payment in Quarterly Instalments, *July 14*, 743.

Romford
- Volunteers—Reason for non-supply of Modern Guns to.
  - *Q.* Mr. L. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 543.

Roscommon
- Assizes—Result of Crown *v.* Reid case.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Hayden; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 20*, 1387–1388.

Rosyth Naval Base
- Expenditure on, Information as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Robertson, *July 19*, 1196; Mr. A. Lee, 1197, 1202; Mr. Buchanan, 1202.

Rotheram, Maltby & Laughton Railway Bill
- *l.* Report from Select Committee,* *July 13*, 509.

Royal Declaration Bill
- *l.* 1r.* *July 10*, 4.

Rules Publication Act, 1893
- Additional Rule Presented, *July 13*, 511.

Runciman. Mr. W. [Dewsbury]
- Algiers, British Consulate in—Hours of Business, Fees Charged, Custom as to issue of Bills of Health to Shipping, etc., *July 18*, 1047.
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 174; *July 11*, 307; *Con.*, *July 17*, 980, 987.
  - Dover, Reason for not Including among Ports of Landing, *July 17*, 875–876.
  - Expenses.
    - Buildings for Accommodation and Examination of Aliens, Payment for, by Shipowners, proposed, *July 11*, 284.
    - Limiting to £24,000 Annually, proposed, *July 11*, 284.
- Vaccination—Decision as to Recommendations of Committee on Fees to Public Vaccinators, *July 17*, 855.

Russell, Mr. T. W. [Tyrone, South]
- Act of Union, Irish Parliamentary Representation under, *July 17*, 895; *July 18*, 1081.
- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 350.
- Cookstown, Extension of Telephone Service to, proposed — Number of Prospective Subscribers, *July 17*, 892.
- Land Act, 1903—Landlords' Interests alone Consulted, *July 20*, 1434, 1435, 1438.
- Land Commission — Fair-rent Appeals, Progress made in Dealing with, *July 20*, 1432.
- Land Judge's Court.
  - Estates in—Return proposed, *July 13*, 563; *July 17*, 888, 889.
  - Winding-up of, Breach of Pledge as to, *July 20*, 1436, 1437.
- Land Purchase.
  - Applications, Method of Dealing with, *July 20*, 1436.
  - Evicted Tenants, Effect of New Regulations on Re-instatement of, *July 20*, 1437.
  - Intimidation, Regulations Dealing with, *July 20*, 1433, 1434.
  - Legal Questions referred to Judicial Commissioner by Estates Commissioners—Dissenting Commissioner to furnish Reasons for Dissenting, *July 20*, 1437, 1438.
  - Staff, Inadequacy of, *July 20*, 1439.
  - Vendors of Estates—Two-thirds of Purchase Money to be in Stock and one-third in Cash, *July 20*, 1438, 1439.
- McFarlane Estate, Sale of, Decision as to Sporting Rights, &c., *July 20*, 1394, 1395.
- Police, Metropolitan, Injuries caused to while on Duty, Question of Compensation, etc., *July 13*, 559.

Russell, Mr. T. W.—*cont.*

Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas—Representation of Ireland—Opinions of the late Sir S. Northcote, and late Marquess of Salisbury, in 1884, *July 19*, 1186.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 18*, 1168.

Russia

Trade Reports Presented *July 18*, 1019; *July 21*, 1500.

Russo Japanese War

British Vessels, Seizure and Detention of, by Russian Cruisers—Claims for Compensation dealt with, Probable Date of Settlement, etc.
Os. Lord Muskerry, Marquess of Lansdowne, Viscount Sidmouth, Earl of Camperdown, *July 13*, 522–524.

Floating Mines in the China Seas, Danger to Shipping from—Employing H.M. Ships to clear away Mines, proposed.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 10*, 49–53; Marquess of Linlithgow, 53

Rutherford, Mr. J. [Lancashire, Darwen]

Administrative County of London Electric Power Company Bill, Committee on, acquainting Members of Appointment prior to Second Reading, *July 11*, 272.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W. [Liverpool, West Derby]

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 137, 147–150.

Rutland, Duke of

London County Council (Tramways) Bill—Postponement of Second Reading for three months, proposed, *July 18*, 1006, 1007.

Manuscripts of—Historical Manuscripts Commission Report Presented, *July 10*, 3, 61.

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford [Northants North]

Walmer Castle—Information as to Sale of Furniture, etc., *July 12*, 383.

St. Albans, Bishop of

Convocations of the Clergy Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 727–729.

St. Michael's, Cornhill

Union of Benefices with St. Peter le Poor and St. Benet Fink—Scheme Presented, *July 19*, 1171; *July 20*, 1299.

"St. Vincent" Training Ship

Abandonment of, in favour of Shore Establishment.
Os. Bishop of Winchester, *July 10*, 54–56; Marquess of Linlithgow, 58.

Salisbury, late Marquess of

Memorial to, in Westminster Abbey, action of Dean of Westminster as to Cornewall Monument, etc.
Os. Sir E. Lees, *July 12*, 1193, 1195; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1194, 1195.

Sale of Butter Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read and discharged and Bill withdrawn, *July 20*, 1489.

Proposals as to taking.
O. Mr. O'Shaughnessy, *July 17*, 900.
Qs. Mr. Culliman, Sir E. Strachey; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 98.

Samuel, Mr. H. L. [Yorkshire, Cleveland]

Accidents in Mines—Period of Time between Accident and Death necessary for case to be described as "Fatal Accident" in Statistics, *July 17*, 854.

Alien Paupers in England and Wales. Number of, and Cost of Relief to, *July 17*, 878.

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 128, 129, 172; *Con.*, *July 17*, 919.

Cabin and Steerage Passages from the Continent, Difference in Cost of, *July 17*, 882.

Expenses—Estimated Cost of Administering the Act, *July 11*, 281.

North-Eastern Railway—Accidents caused by Live Rails, *July 13*, 554.

Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas—Boundary Commission, Appointment and Terms of Reference of, *July 18*, 1053.

Transvaal Treasury, Loans to Private Individuals by, *July 18*, 1059.

U.S.A.—Number of Aliens prohibited from Landing during last five years, etc., *July 17*, 882.

Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill, proposals as to, *July 10*, 101.

Samuel, Sir H. S. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]

Aliens arriving in 1904 as shown in Board of Trade Return, *July 17*, 881.

Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 127, 159–161; *July 11*, 292; 3R., *July 19*, 1272–1274.

Sandes Estate

Sale of, and Proposals for Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1394.

Sandgate Urban District Council Bill

c. Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *July 19*, 1170.

Saunderson, Col. Rt. Hon. H. E. J. [Armagh, North]
  Land Act, 1903, Failure of, alleged, *July 20*, 1429–1432.
  Land Purchase—Vendors of Estates, two-thirds of Purchase Money to be taken by, in Stock, and one-third in Cash, proposed, *July 20*, 1430–1432.

Savings Banks
  Naval—Accounts Presented, *July 10*, 3, 62.
  Regulations, 1905, Presented, *July 10*, 3 61.
  Trustee—Officials, Expenditure and Transactions of—Return ordered, *July 20*, 1365.
  Withdrawals of Sums under £1, new Regulations as to—Facilities given to Fraud, etc.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 18*, 1064.

Schwann, Mr. C. E. [Manchester, North]
  Assam Coolie Labourers' Children, Facilities for Education of, *July 18*, 1052.
  Ceylon.
    Coolie Children, Date of Presenting Committee Report on Education of, *July 20*, 1374.
    Debt, Regulations as to Imprisonment for, *July 17*, 858.
  India—Education of Coolie Class—Reports received, *July 11*, 250.

Science, Royal College of
  Preliminary Report of Departmental Committee Presented, *July 11*, 216, 245.

Scotland
  Secretary—Marquess of Linlithgow.
  Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. C. Scott Dickson.
  Solicitor-General—Mr. E. T. Salvesen.
  For particular places, see their names.
  Boys—Sea-training Scheme—Applications received for Course of Training a Liscard Institution, Liverpool.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson *July 18*, 1067.
  Congested Districts, Amount of Rates of Parishes in—Return ordered, *July 18*, 1043.
  Deer Forests—Return Presented, *July 10*, 60.
  Fisheries, *see that title.*
  Manufactures, Board of, Recommendations of Committee on—Date of introducing Bill.
    Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 12*, 394.
  Rates in Western Hebrides, Legislative Proposals as to.
    Q. Mr. J. Dewar; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 11*, 266.

Scotland—*cont.*
  Sunday Observance, Enforcement of Statutes for, proposed.
    Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 13*, 562.
  Vaccination Prosecutions (1900–1905).
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 19*, 1181.

Scott, Sir S. E. [Marylebone, West]
  Trade Reports, monthly, proposed, *July 11*, 248.

Scott-Montagu, Mr. J. [Hants, New Forest]
  Courts of Summary Jurisdiction—Disposal of Fines, *July 18*, 1061, 1062.
  Divisions, Time occupied by—Inquiry into Mechanical Methods of recording Votes, proposed, *July 11*, 268.
  Motors.
    Parks, Speed Regulations in, *July 11*, 264, 265.
    Prosecutions—Using fines to abate dust nuisance proposed, *July 18*, 1062.

Scottish Agricultural Commission (1904)
  Report, Distribution of, among Agricultural Associations, proposed.
    Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 11*, 246.

Seham Gas Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
  Rt. Hon. A. Lyttelton.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
  Marquess of Lansdowne.

Secretary of State for the Home Department
  Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas.

Secretary of State for India
  Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick.

Secretary (Chief) for Ireland
  Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.

Secretary for Scotland
  Marquess of Linlithgow.

Secretary of State for War
  Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Seely, Mr. C. H. [Lincoln]
  Aliens Bill, *com. July 11*, 336.

Seely, Major J. E. B. [Isle of Wight]
  Aliens Bill, *com.*, *July 10*, 118, 119, 182; *July 11*, 357; *con.*, *July 17*, 920, 950, 967, 968, 985, 3R. *July 19*, 1260–1262.
  Trincomali Naval and Mililary Station, Decision as to, *July 11*, 258

[*cont.*

Seeley, Major J. E. B.—*cont*
Volunteers.
Active Foreign Service, Number of Battalions fit for, *July 10*, 79.
Circular from War Office as to Physical Fitness, Method of Issuing, Failure to consult Staff Officers, etc., *July 13*, 607.
Physical and Dental Examination of—Army Council Resolution as to, *July 10*, 81.
Reduction in Number of, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 607–610, *July 17*, 869.

Selby, Viscount
Introduced to House of Lords, *July 18*, 997.

Serpentine
Bridge over—Reason for delay in repairing.
Q. Capt. Jessel; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 20*, 1373.

Seton-Karr, Sir H. [St. Helens]
Army Rifles, New—Decision as to, *July 18*, 1053.

Sewage Disposal Commission
Report—Date of Issuing.
Q. Col. Legge; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 14*, 740.

Shackleton, Mr. D. J. [Lancashire, Clitheroe]
Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 352; *Con.*, *July 17*, 986.
Navy Dockyards—Deputations from Workmen, Practice of Admiralty as to receiving, *July 12*, 494.
Unemployed Workmen Bill—Possibility of passing into Law this Session, *July 12*, 505, 506; *July 13*, 571.

Shaw, Mr. T. [Hawick Burghs]
Churches (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 12*, 423–439; *com.*, *July 18*, 1107, 1108, 1110, 1111, 1118, 1121, 1123, 1125, 1127, 1128, 1130, 1135, 1137.
Education (Scotland) Bill—*com.*, *July 14*, 757–759, 779, 780, 797, 798.

Sheehy, Mr. D. [Meath, South]
Armagh Licensed Premises—Regulations as to Display of Flags on, *July 10*, 91.
Constabulary, R. I.—Disappearance of Masterson, etc., *July 12*, 399; *July 17*, 886.

Sheep Scab
Oswestry, Losses occasioned in, by Regulations as to movement of Sheep.
Q. Mr. Bright; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 18*, 1044, 1045.

Sheffield University Bill
c. Con. July 20*, 1459.

Shepton Mallet Gas Company (Electric Lighting) Bill
c. Rep. July 13*, 530.

Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies) Bill
l. 2R. *July 11*, 216.
Com. July 17, 847.
Report from Select Committee*, *July 18*, 1019.
Rep. July 20*, 1299.
British and Foreign Shipowners, Placing, on same Footing with regard to Compensation for Injuries to Workmen.
Os. Lord Ludlow, *July 11*, 216–219; Lord Heneage, 219, 220.

Shropshire, Worcestershire and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill
l. Rep. July 17*, 801.

Shuttleworth, Lord
Births, Registration of
Earlier Registration, Compelling, proposed, *July 20*, 1329, 1330.
Still-Births, Legislation to effect Registration of, proposed, *July 20*, 1332.
Physical Deterioration—Institution of Anthropometric Survey, proposed, *July 20*, 1326.
Women, Employment of, before and after Child-Birth—Further Legislation, proposed, *July 20*, 1332, 1333.

Sidmouth, Viscount
Russian Cruisers, Seizure and Detention of British Vessels by, Powers of Volunteer Fleet, &c., *July 13*, 523, 524.

Sinclair, Mr. L. [Essex, Romford]
Commerce, Minister of, Establishment of, and Improvement of *Status* of Board of Trade and Local Government Board, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 101; *July 20*, 1403.
Education Rate—Proposals as to Relief of necessitous Districts, *July 10*, 96.
Romford Artillery Volunteers, Reason for non-supply of Modern Guns to, *July 13*, 543.

Skegness Water Bill
l. 3R.* *July 14*, 685.

Slack, Mr. J. B. [Herts, St. Albans]
Watford Grammar School—Proposals as to addition of Girls' Department, *July 17*, 863.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Belfast—Dundonald Cemetery, Regulations for, *July 18*, 1069.
Education—National School Teachers, Salaries of, under new Rules, *July 20*, 1397.
Income-tax, Payment of, by Roman Catholic Clergy, *July 20*, 1399.
Limerick Moneylending Case, Decision in—Attacks made on Mr. Gaffee by Rev. Mr. Creagh, &c., *July 20*, 1386, 1387.
Magistrates—Speeches made before Election, Limit of Time to debar action by Lord Chancellor, *July 10*, 91.
Poor Law Reform Commission, Date of issuing Report of, *July 10*, 75.

Smith, Rt. Hon., J P. [Lanark, Partick]

Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com. July 18*, 1110-1112, 1127, 1128; *July 19*, 1225.

Date of proceeding with, *July 10*, 108.

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com. July 14*, 784, 785.

Smith, Mr. S. [Flintshire]

Accidents to Children in London Streets, Number of, Measures taken to Prevent, etc., *July 17*, 874.

Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1226, 1227.

Smoke Pollution

Improvement due to stringent Action of the London County Council, etc.
Os. Earl of Meath, *July 20*, 1322, Lord Kenyon, 1343, 1344.

Sneem

Dog-poisoning Cases, Measures taken to apprehend Offenders, &c.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 11*, 266, 267.

Steamer Service — Decision as to Memorial from Residents in District.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 19*, 1182.

Warden, Col., Reason for Police Protection of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 20*, 1388, 1389.

Soares, Mr. E. [Devon, Barnstaple]

Colonial Conference, 1906, Subjects to be discussed at, *July 10*, 99.

Motor Car Act, Proposals as to Amendment of, *July 10*, 100.

Motors.

Continental Rules and Regulations for, etc., Tabling Information as to, proposed, *July 17*, 865.

Parks, in, Speed Regulations for, *July 11*, 265.

South African War

Honours, Refusal of, to Medical Corps—Custom as to Awarding War Honours to the Various Branches of the Army.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 14*, 745.

Military Convicts, Sentences on—Case of T. Leonard.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 10*, 81.

Press Censors, Salaries of.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 19*, 1173, 1174.

Stores, etc., Supply and Disposal of, Documents destroyed to prevent Plague, Information as to.
Q, Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 20*, 1367.

South African War—*cont.*

Stores, etc.—*cont.*

Officers, Punishment of, if Guilty—Regulations as to Limit of Time for Trial by Court Martial, etc.
Qs. Sir J. Woodhouse; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 18*, 1054-1056.

Royal Commission of Inquiry.

Courts-Martial, Powers as to Trials by.
Q. Sir J. Woodhouse; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 544.

Sub-commission, Powers of.
Os. Earl of Halsbury, Marquess of Ripon, *July 10*, 58.

South Barracas (Buenos Ayres) Gas and Coke Company Bill

l. Rep. July 18*, 1017.
3R.* *July 21*, 1497.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

South Lancashire Tramways Bill.

c. Rep. July 13*, 530.
Con. July 19*, 1169.

Southampton.

Post and Telegraph Office Clerks and Sorters, Decision as to Granting Higher Pay to.
Q. Mr. T. Chamberlayne; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 17*, 862.

Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill.

c. Con. July 10*, 59.
3 R* *July 13*, 529.

l. Commons' Amendts. *Con.* July 20*, 1297.

Southesk, Earl of

Sat first in the House of Lords after the Death of his Father, *July 18*, 997.

Southport, Birkdale and West Lancashire Water Board Bill.

c. Rep. July 14*, 735.

Spain

Bull-fight, Presence of British Admiral at, Sanction of Admiralty to, etc
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 17*, 865.

Speaker

Administrative County of London Electric Power Company Bill, Committee on.

Members of, voting on Second Reading, *July 11*, 272.

Power to sit while *Motion* against Appointment was on Agenda, *July 12*, 378.

Aliens Bill.

Amendment out of Order, *July 17*, 911.

Irrelevant Observations, *July 17*, 910.

[*cont.*

Speaker—*cont.*

- Amendment to Question, "That the House do now Adjourn"—out of Order after Midnight, *July 20*, 1494.
- Bills, Passing, into Law—Relative Powers of Government and House, *July 12*, 411, 412.
- Churches (Scotland) Bill, Division of, into two Bills, Relevancy of References to Clause 5, *July 18*, 1095.
- Closure, Discretion as to moving, *July 12*, 500.
- Education (Scotland) Bill—Instruction to Committee not moved on Second Reading, moving of, on Committee Stage out of Order, *July 14*, 746.
- Matter of Urgent Public Importance, Definition of, *July 12*, 390.
- Motion Objected to, necessity for Postponement of, *July 10*, 109.
- Navy Estimates—Matters to be Discussed on certain Votes, *July 12*, 474, 475, 481.
- Questions, *see that title.*
- Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas — Resolution, Procedure in Taking as one Resolution or submitting to Committee of the House, *July 17*, 897.
- Standing Order No. 11, Question, "That the Debate be now Adjourned," put under, *July 19*, 1195.

Spear, Mr. J. W. [Devonshire, Tavistock]

- Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 168; *Con.*, *July 18*, 1149, 1150.
- Canadian Cattle, Removal of Restrictions as to, proposed, *July 12*, 392.
- "Kyber," Loss of — Adoption of Suggestions of Court of Inquiry, *July 20*, 1385.
- Princetown Warders, Protection of, against Attacks, *July 13*, 561.
- Submarine Disasters — Importance of having Salvage Equipment ready in Dockyards, *July 12*, 477, 478.
- Wei-hai-Wei, Maintaining, as a Sanatorium, *July 12*, 477.

Spencer, Earl

- Ballasting of Ships, Loss of Life caused by shifting of Ballast — Carrying out Recommendations of Light Load-line Committee, *July 21*, 1509–1511.
- Convocations of the Clergy Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 721–723, 732.
- Emigration—Numbers and Nationalities of Persons leaving the United Kingdom, Wording of Return respecting, *July 11*, 240.
- Government Defeat in the Division Lobbies, Effect of, on House of Lords, Business, Position of the Government, etc., *July 21*, 1514, 1515.

Spencer, Earl—*cont.*

- Horses suffering from Epizootic Lymphangitis.
  - Measures taken to stamp out the Disease, *July 11*, 224, 225; *July 17*, 842, 843.
  - Military Authorities, Responsibility of, for Introduction of the Disease, *July 11*, 224, 226; *July 17*, 842.
  - Names of Military Centres from which Disease spread, Return as to, proposed, *July 17*, 842.
  - Outbreak in England, Information as to, *July 17*, 841, 842.
- Macedonian Reform Schemes, Progress made with, *July 18*, 1038.
- Morocco, Affairs of—Proposed Conference of French and German Governments—Position of Great Britain, *July 11*, 240.
- Transvaal — Chinese Labour — Flogging Regulations, Alleged Violation of, *July 20*, 1361.
- Yeomanry.
  - Horsing of, in Cases of Emergency, Arrangements as to, *July 17*, 831.
  - Musketry and Signalling Schools, Establishment of, proposed, *July 17*, 830, 831.

Spencer, Mr. C. R. [Northamptonshire, Mid.]

- Volunteers.
  - Age limit—New Regulations, *July*, *13*, 595.
  - Circular to Officers Commanding-in-Chief, *July 13*, 594.
    - Replies received to, *July 10*, 79.
  - Medical Examination—New Regulations, *July 13*, 595.
  - Reduction in Number of, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 596.
  - Teeth, Defective, Regulations as to, *July 13*, 595.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*Postmaster General* [Lancashire, Westhoughton]

- Expenditure proposed in Report of Public Accounts Committee, *July 20*, 1380, 1381.
- Ireland.
  - Dungloe and Burtonport Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *July 12*, 384.
  - Lambeg Vacancy, Appointment of Sligo Postman to, *July 17*, 856.
  - Limerick Night Mail, Facilities for Posting Letters for, at Railway Station, *July 17*, 892.
  - North of Ireland Evening Service *viâ* Greenore, proposed, *July 17*, 891.
- Leave, Annual, to Officers about to Retire, Regulations as to, *July 14*, 741.

[*cont.*

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*cont.*

Mail Service with West Indies, Arrangements as to, *July 18*, 1065.

Postal Orders signed in Irish Language—Case of Mr. T. O'Heidhin, *July 18*, 1076.

Postmen.

Assistant and Auxiliary, Conditions of Employment of, *July 14*, 741.

Provincial—Proposals as to Allowances, *July 13*, 536.

Secretaries to Building Societies, Rescinding Order Prohibiting Acting as, proposed, *July 20*, 1373.

Savings Bank, Withdrawals of Sums under £1—Facilities given to Fraud under new Regulations, *July 18*, 1064.

Southampton Clerks, Decision as to Increasing Pay of, *July 17*, 862.

Staff, Number of Males and Females on, *July 18*, 1044.

Telephone Service, Ireland.

Buncrana, Reason for not including, in Londonderry area, *July 20*, 1400.

Cookstown, Extension to, proposed, *July 17*, 892.

Fermoy, Extension to, proposed, *July 20*, 1401.

Wages, Political pressure by Staff to obtain Increase of, Statement as to—Decision as to receiving Deputation to negotiate disputes, &c., *July 18*, 1062–1064.

Stanley of Alderly, Lord

Convocations of the Clergy Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 726, 727.

Stanmore, Lord

Convocations of the Clergy Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 730-732.

Statistical Abstract [United Kingdom]

Presented (1890-1904) *July 20*, 1298, 1363.

Steel

See Iron and Steel.

Stepney Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Stewart, Sir M. J. Mc.T. [Kirkcudbright]

Churches (Scotland) Bill—Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1096.

Education (Scotland) Bill, *com.*, *July 14*, 780, 781.

Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. M., [Glasgow, College]

Administrative County of London Electric Power Company Bill, Committee on, Members of, voting on Second Reading, *July 11*, 272.

Stonehaven Harbour Order Confirmation Bill

l. 1R.* and 2R.* *July 17*, 803.

3R.* *July 21*, 1498.

Strachey, Sir E., [Somerset, S.]

Sale of Butter Bill, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 98.

Street Trading by Girls

See under Children—Employment of.

Submarines

See under Navy.

Supply

Time alloted to, Decision as to extra three days, &c.

Qs. Mr. Bowles, Sir H. Fowler, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 18*, 1083, 1084; Mr. Dalziel, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. Lough, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H. Fowler, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 19*, 1187–1190.

Supply of Electricity Bill

Proposals as to taking.

Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 18*, 1076, 1077.

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) (No. 1) Bill

c. 1R.* *July 19*, 1192.

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill

c. 1R.* *July 19*, 1193.

Surrey

Education Committee, Accounts of—Auditor's Report.

Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 10*, 68.

Sutherland

Sea Fisheries, Report on, Presented, *July 10*, 3, 61.

Swansea Corporation Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Swine Fever

Investigation into Causes and Symptoms—Date of Presenting Report.

Q. Mr. A. K. Loyd; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 11*, 248.

Outbreaks—Comparison of 1903 and 1904.

Q. Mr. A. K. Loyd; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 11*, 247.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G., [Oxford University]

Workhouses, Nursing of Sick Poor in—Adoption of Committee Recommendations, *July 20*, 1369.

Taxation
Food and Drink, Revenue derived from Taxing, (1886–1905).
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 18*, 1049.

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, E. Toxteth]
Aliens Bill, *com.*, *July 11*, 294, 350; *con.*, *July 17*, 977-979.
Expenses, Limiting, to £10,000 Annually, proposed, *July 11*, 276.
Churches (Scotland) Bill, *com.*, *July 19*, 1243–1250.
Instruction to Committee, *July 18*, 1097, 1098.

Tees Valley Water Board Bill
c. *con.** *July 10*, 59.
3R.* *July 13*, 529.
l. Commons' Amendments *Con.** *July 14* 685.

Telegraph (Construction) Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read and discharged and Bill withdrawn, *July 19*, 1296.

Telegraph Service
Southampton Clerks, &c., Decision as to increasing pay of.
Q. Mr. T. Chamberlayne; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 17*, 862.

Telephone Service
Ireland.
Buncrana, Reason for not including, in Londonderry Area.
Q. Mr. Muldoon; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 20*, 1400.
Cookstown, Extension to, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Doogan, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Lord Stanley, *July 17*, 891, 892.
Fermoy, Extension to, proposed.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 20*, 1401.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 798.
Street Trading by Girls, By-laws drafted by Local Authorities prohibiting, *July 13*, 560.

Thames
Dogs, Alleged Cruelty of Practice of throwing into the Water—Police powers of interference.
Qs. Col. Lockwood; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 13*, 536; *July 17*, 875.
Estuary, Pollution of, by Crude Sewage discharged from Whitstable and Faversham.
Q. Mr. Cohen; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 19*, 1179.

Thames Conservancy Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 10*, 60.
*Con.** *July 17*, 849.
3R.* *July 18*, 1041.
l. 1R.* *July 18*, 1017.

Thomas, Mr. A. [Carmarthen, E.]
Aliens Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 347.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil.]
Merthyr Tydvil, Redistribution Proposals as to, *July 12*, 381.
Newport, Mon., Redistribution Proposals as to, *July 12*, 382.

Thomas, Sir A. [Glamorgan, E.]
Coal Mines, Prevention of Disasters in—Opportunity of discussing in the House, *July 20*, 1380.
Rhondda Valley Mining Disaster, Proposals as to investigating, *July 12*, 413.

Thorburn, Sir W. [Peebles and Selkirk]
Churches (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 12*, 459–461.

Tobacco
Cultivation Experiments, Expenditure on and progress made with in Ireland.
Qs. Mr. W. Abraham; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 398, 399; *July 20*, 1396, 1397.

Tomlinson, Sir W. E. M. [Preston]
Navy—Submarines, Accidents to, Steps taken to prevent recurrence of, *July 12*, 481.
Paupers, Alien, Effect of, on rate of pauperism, *July 17*, 879.

Toulmin, Mr. G. [Bury, Lancashire]
Constituencies of the United Kingdom, List of, etc., proposed, *July 17*, 855
Redistribution of Parliamentary Electoral Areas—Date of Tabling Statement, *July 20*, 1382.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill
c. Report from Standing Committee on Law, *July 10*, 109.
Con. *July 18*, 1166.
Proposals as to taking.
O. Mr. P. O'Brien, *July 17*, 900.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 1186.

Trade, Board of
President—Marquess of Salisbury,
Parliamentary Agents—Retention of Appointment by Messrs. Bircham.
Q. Mr. Benn; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 877, 878.
Status of, Proposals as to improving.
Qs. Mr. L. Sinclair; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 101; *July 20* 1403

Trade and Commerce
Ireland.
Consuls, Instructions to, as to collecting Separate Returns for Irish Trade, etc.
Qs. Mr. Boland ; *As.* Earl Percy, *July 10*, 82, 83 ; *July 13*, 551.
Great Britain, Trade with, Separate Statistics as to, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Lough, Mr. Joyce, Mr. C. Devlin, Mr. Flavin ; *As.* Mr. B. Law, *July 20*, 1401, 1402.
Ministry of Commerce, Proposals as to establishing.
Q. Mr. L. Sinclair ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 101.
Q. Mr. Hoult ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1376.
Q. Mr. L. Sinclair ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1403.

Trade Marks (Re-committed) Bill
*c. Con.** *July 12*, 503.
*Com.** *July 17*, 992. *July 18*, 1168.

Trade Reports
Annual Series Presented, *July 12*, 379 ; *July 13*, 510 ; *July 14*, 686, 736 ; *July 17*, 804, 851 ; *July 18*, 1019, 1043 ; *July 19*, 1171 ; *July 20*, 1298, 1364 ; *July 21*, 1500.
Miscellaneous Series, Presented, *July 18*, 1019, 1043.
Monthly Reports, proposed.
Q. Sir S. Scott ; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 11*, 248, 249.

Trade Unions Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read and discharged and Bill withdrawn, *July 19*, 1295.

Tramways
London County Council (Tramways) Bill, *see that title.*
Passengers, Mr. J. Brown's Invention to facilitate taking up and putting down.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin ; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 14*, 741, 742.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
*l. Rep.** *July 11*, 215.
3R.* *July 13*, 510.
c. 1R.* *July 13*, 531.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee,* *July 17*, 801.
*Com.** *July 18*, 1018.
*Rep.** *July 20*, 1298.
3R.* *July 21*, 1498.

Transvaal
Affairs—Further Correspondence presented *July 21*, 1500, 1517.
Chinese Labour.
Attacks on White Population, alleged, Information as to.
Q. Dr. Macnamara ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 13*, 547.
Disturbances.
Cost of repressing Payment of.
Q. Mr. L. Jones ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 12*, 392.
Measures taken to cope with, etc.
Q. Mr. L. Jones ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 18*, 1060.
Flogging, Regulations as to
Qs. Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Markham ; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 18*, 1060, 1061.
Violations of, alleged, Proposed Government Action, as to.
Os. Lord Coleridge, Duke of Marlborough, Earl Spencer, *July 20*, 1356–1361.
Prisons, Number in, Nature of Offences, etc.
Q. Mr. Burt ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 18*, 1059.
Punishments, Authority for inflicting, Maximum Number of Lashes allowed, etc.
Os. Mr. Bright, Mr. Burt ; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 13*, 548, 549.
Repatriations, Number and Causes of.
Q. Mr. Burt ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 18*, 1059.
Company Law.
Barnato and Johannesburgh Consolidated Investment Companies, Amalgamation of.
Q. Maj. Evans Gordon ; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 10*, 84.
Joint Stock Enterprises, Flotation, etc., of, Amendments of law as to.
Q. Maj. Evans Gordon ; *A* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 10*, 82
Mines.
Crœsus Langlaagte.
Cruelty to Native in, alleged
Qs. Mr. L. Jones ; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 13*, 550.
Illegal Flogging on, alleged.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 18*, 1060 ; Lord Coleridge, Duke of Marlborough, Earl Spencer, *July 20*, 1356–1361.
Good Friday Labour in Jumpers Deep, Prosecution of Europeans for.
Q. Mr. Burt ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 11*, 259, 260.
Labour, White and Coloured, Employed in.
Q. Mr. Cohen ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 13*, 540, 541.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*

Treasury, Amount owing to, by Mr. Van Rensburg—Cabling for Information as to reason for Loan, etc.
Qs. Mr. Whitley, Sir H. Campbell Bannerman; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 11*, 258, 259.
Qs. Mr. Trevelyan, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. H. Samuel; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 18*, 1057–1059.

War Contribution Loan, Payment of, Allocation of Revenue from Premier Diamond Mine, etc.
Qs. Mr. Whitley, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 12*, 393.

Trawling

Scotland—Inquiry, proposed.
Q Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 868.

Treasure Trove

Laws as to, Publication of, in Welsh and English, in the Principality, proposed.
Q. Mr. G. Kenyon; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 18*, 1046.

Treaties

Netherlands—Convention as to Settlement of certain classes of Questions by Arbitration, Presented, *July 21*, 1500.

Trenche, Mr. O'H., Estate of

Sale of, by Landlord—Power of Estates Commissioners to intervene, etc.
Qs. Mr. Reddy; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 19*, 1182, 1183.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorks. W.R., Elland]

Aliens Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 931, 932. 3R. *July 19*, 1262, 1263.
Expenses, Limiting, to £10,000 annually, proposed, *July 11*, 274, 275.

Canada—Tax imposed in Quebec on Commercial Travellers and Agents for Firms outside Canada, *July 17*, 862.

Transvaal—Treasury Loan to Mr. Van Rensburg, Reason for, *July 18*, 1057 1058.

Trincomali

Naval and Military Station, Decision as to Abandonment of.
Qs. Maj. Seeley, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 11*, 258.

Trustee Savings Banks

See under Savings Banks.

Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill

Proposals as to Facilities for passing.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 13*, 534.

Tuberculosis (Bovine)

Committee Reports on, Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 18*, 1045.

Tuke, Sir J. B. [Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities]

Education (Scotland) Bill, Proposals as to taking, *July 20*, 1407.

Tully, Mr. J. [Leitrim, South]

King-Harman Estate.
Ancient Monument, Alleged Injury to, *July 11*, 251.
Rental of Sold and Unsold Portions, *July 14*, 743.
Sale of, Price offered, etc., *July 11*, 250.
Advances exceeding £3,000, Information as to, *July 14*, 744.
Termon Holding, Decision as to Sale of, *July 21*, 1518.
Turbary and Grazing Lands, Disposal of, Sanction of Commissioners to Sale of tenants' interest, etc., *July 10*, 72, 73.

Turkey

Trade Reports Presented, *July 17*, 804; *July 20*, 1298.

Tweedmouth, Lord

Convocations of the Clergy Bill, 2R., *July 14*, 729–730.

Horses suffering from Epizootic Lymphangitis, Measures taken to check the Disease, Compensation for Animals slaughtered, etc., *July 11*, 225, 226.
Names of Military Centres from which Disease spread, Return as to, proposed, *July 17*, 844.

London County Council (Tramways) Bill—Postponement of Second Reading for Three Months, proposed, *July 18*, 1014–1016.

Uganda

Galt, Mr., Information as to Murder of.
Q Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 11*, 260.

Ulster

Agricultural Station, Position of, Proposals as to additional Colleges, &c.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 88, 89.

Unemployed

Work for—Powers of Poor Law Guardians under Act 42 Eliz., c. 2, &c.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 19*, 1179, 1180.

Unemployed Workmen Bill

Amendments proposed by Government, Presented, *July 21*, 1517.

Committee Stage, Date of taking.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Pirie; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 96–98.

Unemployed Workmen Bill—*cont.*

Demonstration in Hyde Park, Obstruction caused to Traffic at Hyde Park Corner by.
Q. Mr. Moon; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 17*, 853.

Possibility of passing into Law this Session.
Os. Mr. A. Henderson, *July 12*, 505; Mr. Shackleton, 505, 506; Mr. J. F. Hope, 506; Mr. J. Redmond, 506, 507; Mr. K. Hardie, 507; Sir A. Acland Hood, Mr. Lough, 508; Mr. Channing, *July 17*, 901.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Pirie, Mr. Crooks, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *July 10*, 410–412.
Qs. Mr. A. Henderson, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Lough, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Broadhurst; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *July 13*, 570–573.
Qs. Mr. Cremer, Mr. T. Chamberlayne; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 867.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 876, 877.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 896.

Proposals as to Taking.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1408.

Union of Benefices Act

St. Michael's, Cornhill, with St. Peter-le-poor and St. Benet Fink—Scheme Presented, *July 19*, 1171; *July 20*, 1299.

United States of America

Aliens—Number Prohibited from Landing during last five years, Number in Prisons, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 17*, 882.

University Colleges

Committee Recommendations—Treasury Minute Presented, *July 19*, 1170; *July 20*, 1298.

University College, London (Transfer) Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Vaccination

Army Vaccine Institute, Lymph produced in, Number of Calves operated on, Disposal of Carcases, etc.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 18*, 1057.

Dundee, Prosecution of Conscientious Objectors in.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 10*, 69, 70.

Vaccination—*cont.*

Exemption Certificates, Powers of Magistrates in refusing.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 13*, 556, 557.

Fees paid to Public Vaccinators, Decision as to Adoption of Recommendations of Committee on.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 17*, 855.

Scotland—Prosecutions (1900–1905).
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 19*, 1181.

Vagrancy Committee

Report, Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 10*, 63.

Vans, Covered

Accidents caused by, Prosecution for Non-Compliance with Bye-law, etc.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 12*, 382.

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]

Aliens Bill. *Con. July 18*, 1138; 3R., *July 19*, 1274–1276.

Army—Efficiency of, Measures Taken to ensure, etc., *July 10*, 76.

Coalfield on Whitworth Estate, Alleged Purchase of, by German Syndicate, *July 20*, 1382.

Compulsory Military Service, War Office Attitude towards, *July 13*, 593, 594.

Juvenile Offenders—Extension of System of Special Courts, proposed, *July 13*, 555.

Unemployed Workmen Bill, Proposals as to Taking, *July 17*, 896.

Volunteers.

Circular asking Commanding Officers to Report as to Efficiency of Corps, etc., *July 13*, 588.

Drafting of, Persons responsible for, *July 13*, 589, 590.

Withdrawal of, proposed, *July 13*, 590.

Conference between Officers and War Office — Arrangements as to Selection of Officers, *July 17*, 870.

Medical Examination of—New Regulations, *July 13*, 589.

Cost of, Provision for Defraying, *July 17*, 871.

Norfolk Commission Report and Recommendations, *July 13*, 590, 591.

Physical and Dental Examination of, Army Council Resolution as to, *July 10*, 80.

Volunteers

Active Foreign Service, Number of Battalions fit for.
Qs. Mr. C. Hobhouse, Maj. Seely; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 10*, 78–80.

Age Limit—New Regulations.
O. Mr. C. R. Spencer, *July 13*, 595.

Ammunition Allowance per Man.
Q. Mr. Fuller; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 12*, 390 391.

Increasing, proposed.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 604.

Annual Return (1904) Presented, *July 11*, 216, 245.

Army Service Corps for, Proposals as to Establishment of.
Os. Mr. McCrae, *July 13*, 587.

Artillery, Armament of, Delay in Re-arming with Modern Guns, etc.
Os. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore, *July 13*, 610–612.

Camping Regulations, Relaxation of, proposed.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *July 13*, 604; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 604, 633; Lord Bingham, 606.

Camps—Expenses falling on Officers, question of Recouping.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 636, 637.

Capitation Grants and Miscellaneous Charges—£1,220,000, *Com.*, *July 13*, 579.

Incidence of, Changes in, proposed.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 635, 636.

Circular Letter from War Office to Officers Commanding-in-Chief, as to Physical Fitness, etc.
Os. Marquess of Ripon, *July 10*, 45; Mr. McCrae, *July 13*, 580, 581; Sir H. Vincent, 588; Mr. C. R. Spencer, 594; Mr. C. Hobhouse, 602; Lord Bingham, 605; Sir A. Hayter, 612; Maj. E. Gordon, 614–616; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 627–629, 634, 635, 638.

Amended Letter, Presented, *July 11*, 245; *July 13*, 511.
Os. Mr. McCrae, *July 13*, 581; Sir H. Vincent, 589.

Drafting of, Persons Responsible for.
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *July 13*, 589, 590.

Method of Issuing, Failure to Consult Staff Officers, etc.
O. Maj. Seely, *July 13*, 607.

Replies to, Received.
Q. Mr. C. R. Spencer; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 10*, 79.

Withdrawal of, proposed.
Os. Mr. McCrae, *July 13*, 587; Sir H. Vincent, 590.

Volunteers—*cont.*

Commands, Re-organisation of, Information as to.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 17*, 833, 835, 836; Earl of Donoughmore, 833–835; Lord Harris, 834, 835.

Conference between Officers and War Office—Arrangements as to Selection of Representative Officers.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr B. Davenport, *July 17*, 870.

Cost of, Total.
O. Mr. Churchill, *July 13*, 621.

Disbandment of Battalions—Liability for Legitimate Expenditure of Corps.
Qs. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 10*, 77.

Discussion in the House, Opportunity for.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 10*, 102; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 102, 103.

Division of, into Two Classes, proposed.
Os. Mr. McCrae, *July 13*, 584, 586.

Duties of, Definition of.
Os, Mr. C. Hobhouse, *July 13*, 600, 601; Sir G. Parker 617, 618; Col. Kenyon-Slaney, 671.

Efficiency.

Measures Taken to Attain—Government Proposals.
Q. Mr. C. Allen; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July* 20, 1368.

Reports of General Officers Commanding-in-Chief.
Os. Mr. McCrae, *July 13*, 581, 582.

Foreign Service, Physical Fitness for—Medical Examination, etc.—Terms of Amended Circular.
Os. Mr. McCrae, *July 13*, 581, 582, 585; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 582, 627; Sir H. Vincent, 589; Mr. C. R. Spencer, 595; Lord Bingham, 605.
Qs. Mr. C. Allen; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 19*, 1174, 1175.

Inspection Period Ordered by Circular Letter, Postponement of.
Q. Mr. C. Allen; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 10*, 80.

Medical Corps, Reason for Refusal of War Honours to.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 14*, 745.

Medical Examination, Provision for defraying cost of.
Qs. Mr. Fuller; *As.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *July 12*, 390.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent, Mr. McCrae; *As.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 17*, 871.

Mobilisation arrangements, Information as to.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 17*, 833, 835, 836; Earl of Donoughmore, 833, 834; Lord Harris, 834.

Volunteers—*cont.*

Norfolk Commission Report and Recommendations.
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *July 13*, 590, 591.

Physical and Dental Examination of, Information as to Resolution of Army Council regarding.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent, Maj. Seely; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 10*, 80, 81.

Reduction in number of, Proposals as to
Os. Mr. McCrae, *July 13*, 583, 584, 586; Mr. C. R. Spencer, 596; Mr. C. Hobhouse, 600-602; Lord Bingham, 606; Maj. Seely, 607–610; Sir A. Hayter, 612–614; Mr. Fuller, 616, 617; Sir G. Parker, 617–620; Mr. Churchill, 621, 622, 678; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 628–632, 639–642; Sir H. J. Campbell-Bannerman, 640, 641; Mr. C. Warner, 641.
Qs. Maj. Seely; *As.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 17*, 869, 870.

Reorganisation Proposals.
Os. Mr. McCrae, *July 13*, 580.

Romford Artillery Volunteers, Reason for Non-supply of Modern Guns to.
Q. Mr. L. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 543.

Separate Representation at the War Office, proposed.
O. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *July 13*, 603.

Shooting.

"First Class Shot," Definition of.
Q. Mr. McCrae; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 10*, 79.

Standard of Efficiency, Measures Taken to Attain, etc.
Qs. Mr. McCrae; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 542, 543, 546.
Q. Mr. F. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *July 13*, 546.
Qs. Mr. McCrae; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 17*, 869, 870.

Tests for—New Regulations.
Os. Mr. McCrae, *July 13*, 583.

South African War, Services rendered during.
Os. Mr. McCrae, *July 13*, 580; Col. Denny, 599.

Teeth, Defective, Regulations as to.
O. Mr. C. R. Spencer, *July 13*, 595.

War Office attitude towards—Impossible Standards set, etc.
Os. Col. Denny, *July 13*, 597–599; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 623, 624, 631, 632.

Voters

Plural Voters in United Kingdom, Number of.
Qs. Mr. Black; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 13*, 554.

Wales

Treasure Trove, Publication of Laws as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. G. Kenyon; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 18*, 1046.

Wallace, Mr. R. [Perth]

Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com*, *July 18*, 1106, 1112, 1124, 1126, 1133.

Wallis Estate

O'Keeffe, Mr. T., Application for Reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 92.

Walmer Castle

Sale of Furniture, etc., Information as to.
Q. Col. Stopford Sackville; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 12*, 383.

War

Dissemination of News in time of, Government Control over—Japanese laws, etc.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 13*, 512–518; Marquess of Linlithgow, 518.

War Office

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Under Secretary—Earl of Donoughmore.

Financial Secretary—Mr. W. B. Davenport.

Financial Branch.

Reorganisation of.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 659, 660; Col. Nolan, 673.

South African War, Employment during.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 19*, 1175.

Kyles of Bute, Purchase of Land in.
Qs. Mr. Dobbie; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 18*, 1056, 1057.

Staff Appointments, Limit of time for Holding—Reason for extending Appointment of Assistant Adjutant-General.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 20*, 1374, 1375.

Work of, Hostile Public Criticism of.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 647, 663, 664; Mr. C. Warner, 664; Mr. Buchanan, 667.

War Stores (Commission) Bill

l *Com.*, *Rep.*, and 3R.* *July 10*, 58.

Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T. [Stafford, Lichfield]

Army.

Desertions, Diminution in Number of, *July 13*, 664, 665.

Guns, New, Cost of, to be defrayed by India, alleged, *July 13*, 665.

Reorganisation Proposals, *July 13*, 665.

[*cont.*

Warner, Mr. T. C. T.—*cont.*
Navy Loans Bills, Abandonment of System of, *July 19*, 1205, 1206.
Volunteers, Reduction in Number of, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 640.
War Office, Work of, Alleged Hostile Criticisms on, *July 13*, 664.

Wason, Mr. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
Alcohol for Manufacturing Purposes—Proposals as to Regulations, *July 19*, 1176, 1177.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 762, 773.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
Beaufort Castle Shooting Case, Procedure as to, *July 13*, 562.
Churches (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 1126.
Proposals as to, *July 12*, 408–410.
Motor Car Act, Proposals as to Inquiry into working of, *July 10*, 99.
Scottish Agricultural Commission Report, Distribution of, proposed, *July 11*, 246.
South African War—Press Censors, Salaries of, *July 19*, 1173, 1174.
Sunday Observance Statutes, Enforcement of, proposed, *July 13*, 562.
Uganda—Information as to Murder of Mr. Galt, *July 11*, 260.
Zionists, Offer of Territory to, in East Africa—Tabling Papers proposed, *July 13*, 549.

Watches
Gold or Silver Plate, Definition as to—Decision in case of Goldsmiths' Company *v.* W. Wyatt.
Q. Mr. Jno. Campbell; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 12*, 394.

Waterford
Evictions and Reinstatements.
Qs. Mr. Power; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 10*, 72, 92, 93; *July 13*, 539.
Horses, Epizootic Lymphangitis Outbreak among, Restrictions on Movement of Horses.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 13*, 539, 540.

Waterford, Estate of Marquess of
Blackditches Farm—Reinstatement Application of Mrs. Cullen.
Q. Mr. Jas. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 18*, 1072.

Watford
Grammar School—Proposals as to Addition of Girls' Department, Local Opinion of Scheme, etc.
Q. Mr. Slack; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 17*, 863, 864.

Wattstown Colliery
Disaster, Inquiry into, proposed, and Provision of Special Apparatus for Rescue Parties—Opportunity for Discussion in the House, etc.
Qs. Mr. T. Richards, Mr. Jno. Wilson, Mr. K. Hardie, Sir H. Campbell Bannerman, Sir A. Thomas; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 1378–1380.

Wayood & Co., Messrs.
Government Contracts—Refusal to Employ Union Men, Alleged.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 14*, 742.

Weaver Navigation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 11*, 213.

Wei-hai-wei
Expenditure on Sanatorium, Information as to
Os. Mr. Whitley, *July 12*, 471; Mr. Pretyman, Mr. R. Lucas, 472; Mr. Spear, 477; Mr. C Macdona, 478, 479; Mr. A. Lee, 483.
Retention of, as a Naval Base by Great Britain.
Os. Mr. C. Macdona, *July 12*, 478, 479; Sir F. Banbury, 480; Mr. H. Robertson, 481, 482.

Weights and Measures Act, 1904
Regulations under, Date of Tabling.
Q. Mr. S. Roberts; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *July 10*, 70, 71.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Aberdeen Educational Trust Home, Date of Opening, Application for Admission, etc., *July 18*, 1068.
Army.
Theatres, Regimental, Regulations for Management of, *July 12*, 385.
Vaccine Institute, Lymph Produced in, Number of Calves Operated on, Disposal of Carcases, etc., *July 18*, 1057.
Avoch Harbour Works, Date of Completion of, *July 12*, 379.
Beaufort Castle Shooting Case.
Date of Trial, Information as to, *July 20*, 1386.
Procedure as to, *July 13*, 562, 563.
Borneo, British North—Conditions of Employment of Chinese Coolie Labour, *July 11*, 261, 262; *July 17*, 861; *July 19*, 1172; *July 20*, 1371.
Boys, Sea-training Scheme for—Applications Received for Course of Training at Liscard Institution, Liverpool, *July 18*, 1067.
Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill, Proposals as to Taking, *July 11*, 266 *July 20*, 1406.

[*cont.*

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*

Fisheries—Reason for Sale of "Norna," Amount Realised, etc., *July 11*, 265.

India—Raja of Pannah—Reason for Banishment, *July 13*, 551.

Matheson Estate Evictions, Legislation to deal with, proposed, *July 13*, 568.

Motors—Licences for Drivers; Printing Photographs of Holders on, proposed, *July 11*, 264.

Navy—Barrack Theatres, Regulations as to Management of, *July 13*, 532.

Deal Theatre, Regulations as to, *July 13*, 545 ; *July 20*, 1376.

Post Office — Expenditure Proposed in Report of Public Accounts Committee, *July 20*, 1380.

Railways—Narrowness of Footboards on Express Trains from the North, *July 20*, 1380.

Savings Bank Withdrawals — Facilities given to Fraud by New Regulations as to Sums under £1, *July 18*, 1064.

Vaccination.

Exemption Certificates, Powers of Magistrates in Refusing, *July 13*, 556, 557.

Prosecutions in Scotland (1900-1905) *July 19*, 1181.

Welby, Lt. Col. A. C. E. [Taunton].

Army—Home Battalions, Western Command—Reasons for substituting Exeter for Taunton as Head-quarters, *July 13*, 674.

Welby, Sir C. G. E. [Notts., Newark]

Isolation Hospitals—Regulation as to payment of fees to Local Practitioner who is also a member of the Local Authority and attends his own patients, *July 10*, 67.

Wemyss, Earl of

Army.

Commands, Reorganisation of, Information as to, *July 17*, 833, 835, 836

Mobilisation Arrangements, Information as to, *July 17*, 833, 835, 836.

Preparedness for War—Lord Roberts' opinion, *July 10*, 47.

Home Defence.

Invasion, Possibilities of, *July 10*, 4-10.

Navy as Sole Means of, Supplementing, by Increased Land Defences, proposed, *July 10*, 4, 10-13, 48, 49.

Raids, Possibility of--Strengthening Land Defences, proposed, *July 10*, 10-13.

Militia—Reorganisation Proposals, *July 10*, 47, 48.

Wemyss Tramways Order Confirmation Bill

l. 1R.* *July 21*, 1501.

Wenlock, Lord

Yeomanry.

Army Manœuvres, Possibility of attaching Yeomanry Officers to, *July 17*, 824.

Classes and Lectures for Senior Officers, establishment of, proposed, *July 17*, 817.

Drill Book, Necessity for, *July 17*, 818.

Horsing of, in Cases of Emergency, Arrangements for, *July 17*, 817, 831, 832.

Mobilisation of, Arrangements for, Tabling Papers relating to, proposed, *July 17*, 816, 832.

West Indies

Mail Service, Arrangements as to.

Q. Mr. Lamont ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 18*, 1065.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill

c. Con. July 11*, 242.

3R.* *July 14*, 734.

l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 17*, 802.

Westmeath, Earl of

Land Act, 1903, Working of, Reason for alleged Failure of, etc., *July 14*, 717.

Westminster Abbey

Cornewall, Captain, Monument to, proposal of Dean of Westminster to remove.

Os. Sir E. Lees, *July 19*, 1193 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1194, 1195.

Drawings relative to, Tabling, proposed.

Q. Sir E. Lees ; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 19*, 1181.

Westport

Floods, Cause and Prevention of.

Q. Dr. Ambrose ; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 13*, 538.

Whitby Urban District Council

c. Con. July 10*, 60.

3R.* *July 13*, 529.

l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 14*, 685.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 14*, 787.

White, Mr. P. [Meath, N.]

Land Purchase—Advances applied for under Act of 1903, Information as to, *July 21*, 1518.

Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill

l 3R.* *July 13*, 509.

c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July 18*, 1041.

Whitely, Mr. G. [Yorks, W.R., Pudsey]
Aliens Bill.
Expenses.
Buildings for Accommodation and Examination of Aliens, Payment for, by Shipowners, proposed, *July 11*, 282
Estimated Cost of Administering the Act, *July 11*, 282.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]
Administrative County of London Electric Power Company Bill—Committee, *Motion* against appointment of, Date of proceeding with, *July 12*, 378.
Aliens Bill, *Com. July 11*, 223, 343, 344.
Expenses, Limiting, to £10,000 annually, proposed, *July 11*, 273, 274.
Churches (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 12*, 461–463.
Surrey Education Committee, Auditor's Report on Accounts of, *July 10*, 68.
Transvaal.
Treasury, Amount Owing to, by Mr. Van Rensburg—Cabling for Information, etc., *July 11*, 258, 259.
War Contribution Loan, Payment of, Allocation of Revenue from Premier Diamond Mine, etc., *July 12*, 393.
Wei-Hai-Wei, Expenditure on, Information as to, *July 12*, 471.

Whitstable
Sewage Discharge and Pollution of Thames Estuary.
Q. Mr. Cohen; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 19*, 1179.

Whitworth Estate Coalfield
See Coal—Welsh Coalfield.

Wick
"Pioneer" Motor Fishing Boat, Visit of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 17*, 864.

Wicklow
Evicted Tenants, Applications from, and Reinstatements Effected.
Q. Mr. Jas. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 18*, 1070.
Untenanted Land Purchased in.
Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 397, 398.

Wigan Corporation Bill
c. Rep. July 18*, 1041.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 20*, 1362.
l. 1R* *July 20*, 1297.

Williams, Mr. A. O. [Merionethshire]
Merionethshire Education Grants, Payments of, *July 10*, 85.

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com., July 14*, 747–749, 754, 762.

Wilson, Mr. C. H. [Hull, West]
Aliens Bill, *Com., July 11*, 293; *Con., July 17*, 932.
Shipping Companies, Provision for Protection of, *July 10*, 66.

Wilson, Mr. F. W. [Norfolk, Mid.]
Army Shooting Standard, Measures Taken to Attain, *July 13*, 546.
King's Lynn, Redistribution, Proposals as to, *July 13*, 568.
Volunteer Shooting Tests—Standard of Efficiency, Measures Taken to Attain, *July 13*, 546.

Wilson, Mr. John [Durham, Mid.]
Aliens Bill, *Com., July 10*, 125, 126, 131, 134, 135; *Con., July 17*, 925-927; *July 18*, 1146, 1147; 3R., *July 19*, 1280.
Coal Mines, Disasters in—Provision of Special Apparatus for Rescue Parties, proposed, *July 20*, 1370.

Wilson, Mr. John [Glasgow, St. Rollox]
Aliens Bill, *Con., July 17*, 934.

Wiltshire
Parliamentary Representation under Redistribution Scheme.
Q. Mr. Fuller; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 893.

Winchester, Bishop of
Navy.
Dockyards, Discharges from—System Adopted by the Admiralty, *July 10*, 54, 55.
"St. Vincent" Training Ship, Information as to Abandonment of, *July 10*, 54–56.

Windsor, Lord—*First Commissioner of Works.*
Quit and Crown Rents, Ireland—Return as to Sums Received for Redemption and Purchase since 1897, proposed, *July 20*, 1354.

Wine
Cape Colony, Canadian Preferential Treatment for—Similar Preference in United Kingdom, proposed.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 17*, 859.

Wireless Telegraphy
Navy, Application of System in.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 247.

Wireless Telegraphy Act
Working of (January to March, 1905), Number of Licences granted, etc.,—Return Presented, *July 18*, 1042; *July 19*, 1170.

Wolverton, Lord
Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *July 20*, 1302.
Horses suffering from Epizootic Lymphangitis.
Origin of Civilian Outbreaks, Information as to, *July 17*, 844.
Outbreak in England, Information as to, *July 17*, 840, 841.

Women
Employment of, before and after Childbirth—Further Legislation, proposed.
Qs. Earl of Meath, *July 20*, 1324; Lord Shuttleworth, 1332, 1333; Marquess of Londonderry, 1340.

Woodhouse, Sir J. T. [Huddersfield]
South African War Stores.
Officers, Provisions for Punishment of, if Guilty, *July 18*, 1054-1056.
Royal Commission of Inquiry—Courts-martial, Powers as to Trials by, *July 13*, 544.

Woolwich
Dockyard Building Contract of Messrs. Playfair—Hours of Labour and Overtime Pay of men employed.
Q. Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 14*, 744.

Woolwich Borough Council Bill
l. 3R.* *July 10*, 2.

Worcestershire County Council (Bridges) Bill
l. *Rep.** *July 11*, 214.
3R.* *July 14*, 685.

Workhouses
Nursing of Sick Poor, Adoption of Committee Recommendations as to.
Q. Mr. Talbot; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 20*, 1369.
Scotland—Aged Paupers in Poorhouses in 1881, 1891, 1901 and 1904, information as to,
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *July 13*, 534, 535.

Workington Harbour and Dock Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 13*, 530.
*Con.** *July 18*, 1041.

Workmen's Compensation Act
Extension of Provisions of, to Seamen and Masters of Ships proposed.
Qs. Lord Muskerry, Duke of Marlborough, *July 18*, 1040.

Workmen's Compensation Act, Amendment Bill
Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. Fenwick; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 10*, 101.

Wrightson, Sir T. [St. Pancras, East]
Rhenish Westphalian Coal, Iron and Steel Syndicates, Export Bounties paid by, *July 18*, 1048.

Yemen
See under Arabia.

Yeomanry
Army Manœuvres, Possibility of Attaching Yeomanry Officers to.
Qs. Earl of Donoughmore. *July 17*, 824; Lord Wenlock, 824.
Drill book, necessity for.
Qs. Lord Wenlock, *July 17*, 818; Earl of Donoughmore, 827.
Horsing of, In cases of Emergency, arrangements for—Tabling Papers as to, proposed.
Qs. Lord Wenlock, *July 17*, 817, 831, 832; Lord Harris, 819, 832; Earl of Donoughmore, 826, 832; Lord Lovat, 830; Earl Spencer, 831.
Mobilisation of, Arrangements for, Tabling Papers relating to, proposed.
Qs. Lord Wenlock, *July 17*, 816, 832; Lord Harris, 818, 819; Earl of Donoughmore, 825; Lord Lovat, 827, 829.
Musketry and Signalling Schools, establishment of, proposed.
Qs. Lord Harris, *July 17*, 821 Earl of Donoughmore, 823-825; Lord Lovat, 828; Earl Spencer, 830, 831.
Officers, Senior, Classes and Lectures for, Establishment of, proposed.
Qs. Lord Wenlock, *July 17*, 817; Earl of Donoughmore, 823, 824; Lord Lovat, 828, 829.
Reduction in Number, Increased Efficiency resulting from.
Qs. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13* 626, 657; Mr. Buchanan, 668 669.
Stores, Emergency, Arrangements as to supply of.
Qs. Lord Harris, *July 17*, 819, 820, 826; Earl of Donoughmore, 826, 827.

Yerburgh, Mr. R. A. [Chester]
Malta Fever, Origin of, and Number of Men Invalided by (1895–1905), *July 20*, 1371.

Zionists
Africa, East, Decision as to Territory in
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr Lyttelton, *July 11*, 260.
Tabling Papers, Proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 13*, 549.